



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.


About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HD WIDENER



HW T7ZH 8



L^r Peabody
with affectionate regards
from the author.

THE
CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS,

OR

SCRIPTURAL VIEWS OF BAPTISM AND THE
LORD'S SUPPER.

Scitly BY
JOHN S. STONE, D. D.

GRISWOLD LECTURER, IN THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL
CHURCH IN PHILADELPHIA.

NEW YORK:
ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH,
770 BROADWAY.
1866.

PREFACE.

THE Author has endeavored to give to the following Treatise as little of a controversial character as he could, consistently with the object which he had in view. Truth stands opposite to error ; and to make their contrast seen and felt, it is sometimes desirable to present both. To this, the Author has been almost resistlessly led by the force of circumstances ; and it will be readily perceived that the considerations, which induced him to present what he conscientiously believed to be erroneous views on the subject, which he has treated, bound him, at the same time, to present them, not in his own, but in the language of their advocates. He has, however, endeavored to quote fairly, and has honestly sought to put the Theories, which he opposes, in a light which their advocates must acknowledge to be just : and, having done this, he has busied himself with those Theories, and not with the men who hold them. Against their views he has spoken strongly : against the men he has said nothing. He readily concedes to them, what he is desirous may be conceded to himself,—honesty and sincerity in the views embraced, and solicitude to promote the best interests of the Gospel and Church of Christ. He can feel no pleasure in supporting even what he believes

to be vital truth by so poor a prop as an attempt to excite prejudice against those, who embrace even what he believes to be dangerous error. Nor has he any desire that the views, which he has presented, should stand any further than they can stand on the basis of Truth as revealed in the Word of God, recognized in the Standards of our Church, and illustrated by its own inward light.

He has quoted the authors, to whom he refers, only so far as was necessary to develop their peculiar views on the points under examination. He has not attempted to follow them through any extended train of reasoning, illustration, or reference to authorities. There is, therefore, a sense in which the present work is not controversial. It does not profess to be a special answer to any other work, or a full critique upon any other treatise. It is, rather, an independent exposition of the nature of the Christian Sacraments; referring for authority mainly to the Scriptures, and showing, subordinately, the harmony between the Scriptures and our own Ecclesiastical Standards.

The reasons which have influenced him in bringing his cause for trial before the sole tribunal of the Scriptures, are two :

1. In the first place, while he has been desirous of writing something not wholly unworthy the attention of the more learned, his chief desire has been to present truths of the highest importance to that far greater class of minds, which have the power of thinking justly, but which ordinarily have little leisure for following learned research beyond the Bible and the accessible helps to its interpretation. In a word, he has written, not so much for learned

divines, as for the intelligent laity of the Church ; while his humble hope is that both classes will find, in what he has written, somewhat worthy of their serious consideration. To have made the work larger by a full quotation and examination of authorities would have been easy, and, to the one class, perhaps useful : but the work has already reached a size not at first intended, and needing for the other class curtailment rather than addition.

2. In the second place, he has been strongly influenced in the course which he has taken, by the continued prevalence of views, which, to his apprehension, threaten the dislodgment of the Bible from its true place of importance in the settlement of all questions involving the purity and even the vitality of the Gospel and Church of Christ.

We have seen, wrought into distinct shape among us, the notions that Christ has left Himself perpetually incarnate through the Sacraments in the living body of the Visible Church ; and that He now dispenses the gifts of the Holy Spirit, not by imparting them directly to the Individual through the private study, or the public preaching of the Word, or through that believing prayer, which seeks those gifts, when other means of grace are inaccessible ; but by having, once for all, deposited those gifts in the hands of His Apostles alone, to be by them handed down through successors, and by successors through Sacraments to the Body of the Church. Now, these are notions, which can never be plausibly maintained except by aids, extraneous to the Scriptures themselves, as those aids may be found in later TRADITION. It is impossible to find adequate support for them in the WORD OF GOD. With that Divine Stan-

dard they are rather in conflict. They must appeal from it to another Rule. It is evident, therefore, that, just so far as these notions prevail, the Scriptures must be sinking in the practical esteem both of Clergy and of Laity ; while Tradition simultaneously rises to the rank of virtually Supreme Arbiter and Judge in all the most important questions, which can affect the purity of the Gospel and the Church, and the destinies of the Kingdom of Christ on Earth. On the Theory, involved in these notions, the Ministry of the Church holds a prerogative, which, as our nature is constituted, can never be safe in human hands ; which has already proved the means of the most crushing Spiritual Despotism ; and which must always force its holders into ever greater departures from the simplicity of the Gospel into the corruptions of Error.

It is nothing else than the power of this Theory which has driven so many, both in the English and in the American Episcopal Church, into the doctrine of "DEVELOPMENT ;" a doctrine, which rests on the acknowledged silence, and even repugnancy, of the Scriptures, and of sound, primitive Tradition itself, in regard to certain matters both of faith and of practice, notoriously prevalent in the middle and later ages of the Church ; and which, so far as the doctrine is found among Protestants, is confessedly derived from those modern Romish theorists, De Maistre and Möhler, and was invented by them in defense of the monstrous errors of the Papal Supremacy, the worship of Saints and Angels, of Images and the Virgin Mary, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Celibate, and Transubstantiation itself.

This doctrine, or Theory, or Philosophy of "Develop-

ment" consists in maintaining that Christianity is a progressive system ; that, at first, it existed in an imperfect GERM only ; that it has innate tendencies to growth, and even to the development of forms, which have no embryo in the original ; and that, hence, those doctrines and practices of Mediæval and Modern Christianity of which the Bible and PRIMITIVE Antiquity know nothing, or which they know only to condemn, are but the results of this law of "Development." It is a misnomer. It should be called—the law of "ACCRETION," bringing together elements without affinity, and binding them in the bands of heterogeneity.

Upon the tendency of this Theory to put arguments into the mouth of the Infidel, who contends that Christianity, in this process of "Development," has not only reached its full growth, but also passed beyond into a state of senility and decay ; and upon its tendency to favor Idolatry, Polytheism, Pantheism and even practical Atheism ; it is not necessary to dwell. It is enough for present purposes to say, that the natural inference from the Theory is, that there has never been either error or corruption in the Church Catholic ; that these are the faults of heretics and schismatics alone ; that the Mediæval Church was more perfect than the Primitive ; and that Rome, since the Council of Trent, is more perfect than she was before the Fourth of the Lateran.

The notions, just referred to, of Christ's perpetuated Incarnation of Himself, through the Sacraments, in the living body of the Visible Church ; and of the deposit of the gifts of the Spirit, once for all, in the hands of the Priesthood, to be dispensed by their authoritative act alone,

can no more be maintained, on the ground of Scripture and of primitive Antiquity, than the worst errors and corruptions of the Mediæval Church. A far later Tradition is indispensable to their support. Hence, the tendency, so perceptible, to magnify the authority of the later "fathers," as they are called ; to make citations from their writings ; and to revive among us the credit of their names. The system, on which this support of doctrines and practices rests, carries within itself, indeed, a tendency to this sort of self-Development, to this ceaseless addition and accretion to itself of things unchristian and antichristian. It is ever pushing itself and forcing its advocates farther and farther upon the grounds of Tradition ; and, with every step in its movement, is more and more effectually losing sight of the true and only tenable ground of Scripture. Every year that this movement is followed will the study of the Bible be diminished, and that of the Authors of the Middle Age increased ; nor need we be surprised to find ourselves, at no distant day, verging close upon a period, when the Bible will indeed be known in name, but in little more than name, as a Book, which the subtle philosophy of "Development" has learned to construe into at least a toleration of its, to real Christianity, progressively alien conceptions.

In the midst of such a tendency, new to us at least, yet already sufficiently perceptible, the resort to the Bible alone, as Umpire in the great questions, which have been examined, was even peculiarly proper. Authority and Primitive Tradition are good and valuable in their appropriate places, and for their appropriate ends ; but woe to the Church of our love, if she ever allow a fondness for the Authority and

Traditions of later ages to allure her, by degrees, away from her past reverence for the Word of God alone, as her Rule of Faith. She will be drawn thereby into mists and darkness, through which her passage will be as perilous as would be that of a noble ship over an ocean, abounding every where with rocks and quicksands, and amid fogs so perpetually dense, that neither sun, nor moon, nor yet the guiding pole-star, could ever once be seen.

As yet, our perils are new ; and there may be somewhat even alluring in the undefinedness and excitement of the solemn future before us. To the human heart and imagination there is certainly much that is attractive in the awful prerogatives, with which it is now sought to re-invest the ministerial character ; and in a religion, which, arraying itself in the imposing forms of a dim Antiquity, professes to come to us with a sort of infallible guide to salvation, requiring little more of its recipients than profound reverence, implicit obedience, and unquestioning submission to the prerogatives, the prescriptions, and the persons of its authorized Hierophants. Nevertheless, in these very circumstances, opens the great Deep of our perils ; and the forces, which, in combination with such attractions, are pushing us into the abyss, are the ever restless evils of an age, prone to excitement and tossed with change.

From such remarks, let it not be supposed that the Author is inclined to "speak evil of Dignities." Office is a sacred thing. Its authority has source and sanction in God. This is especially true in Ecclesiastical Government. Those who, in higher and lower degree, hold commissions from Christ, hold peculiarly sacred things ; things,

which may never, with impunity, be treated with other than the most respectful regard. Personal vices, indeed, can never be justly shielded by the sanctity of office ; but, so far as the ministers of Christ hold their commissions in clean hands, even their persons are naturally regarded with somewhat of the respect, which is due to their office itself. But, the more sacred is office, the more sacredly should it be guarded against all stretch of prerogative and against all assumption of power ; especially, when prerogative and power put on the impressive habiliments of spiritual attributes, and stand in the awful interspace between God and man. To stretch prerogative *there*, to assume power *then*, is, either arrogantly or with mistaken aim, to abuse office to the worst of purposes ; and, since men, when provoked by abuses, are sometimes blind to real differences, such a course is, peradventure, to invite invasion, even of what is in itself sacred. It is to step beyond the line, which, with a midway limit, divides that awful interspace, whereon are transacted the concerns of the soul and of eternity. It is to get nearer to God than to man, not in holiness, but in an attempt to wield powers, which are never safe out of God's hands.

Oh ! for the spirit of uncommon wisdom and of uncommon grace, poured out upon us from on high, to keep us safe amid our various and thickening perils ; that we may still live on, abiding quietly by the light, which shineth from the WORD, and standing simple in allegiance to the FAITH, which that Word reveals.

Whether the work, herewith offered, has been dictated by any portion of such a spirit of wisdom ; whether it car-

ries with it any thing of such a spirit of grace ; and whether it is to be made in any degree tributary to such results ; are questions, which must be referred for answer, not to the too often blinded judgment of Authorship, but to the judgment of Him, unto whose disposal the whole is committed ; who standeth in the midst of His Golden Candlesticks ; and who holdeth in His right hand not only the greater stars of His ministry, but also the feebler lights thereof, which seek to gather and send forth their beams from Christ.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

THE revision, to which the present work has been submitted, has led, it may be hoped, to an improved, rather than to an altered Edition. Some portions of the work have been re-written with special reference to former criticisms—some friendly and some unfriendly—with a view to clear the meaning of some passages, and to strengthen the position of others ; but no essential modification has been made of the principles on which the Treatise rests. In this respect, the Author has seen no reason for either change or modification. He sincerely wishes that he could have seen no reason for bringing the work to a second edition. But in this he is sadly disappointed. The movement within our Church, which first prompted his labors, has since changed the mode of its operation, but not the direction of its aim. It has been well observed that the effort, at first, was, through change of Doctrine to bring in Ritualism ; but that now the aim is, through Ritualism to bring in change of Doctrine ; the real object, in both cases, being to make both Doctrine and Ritualism within our Church more harmonious with those of the Latin and Greek Communions in Europe and Western Asia. It need

not be urged that, to us, the latter form of the movement is more dangerous than the former. The corrupt doctrines of Mediæval Tradition call for a corresponding Ritualism ; but this Ritualism, when established, has the power both of breeding and of nursing the corrupt doctrines of Mediæval Tradition. In this world the two cannot live apart any more than body and soul ; but, once joined, the body of Ritualism is the living propagandist and conservator of the soul of corrupt Traditionary Doctrine.

The Author may be allowed to join with others in the conviction that the present is, in some respects, an age of peculiar peril, not merely to our Protestant Episcopacy, but even to Evangelical Christianity itself. Upon this Christianity, modern Science, on the one side, is, by some, made a battery for attack ; while, on the opposite, ancient Superstition is, by others, turned into a fortress of defense. The immediate consequences must be disastrous ; while the ultimate danger is, that, when Science shall have been found,—as it certainly will be,—the true friend of Christian faith ; Superstition will remain both the defender and the propagator of a corrupt religion both in doctrine and in practice ; for, although human Science may finally prove to be harmonious with Christian faith, yet, when the latter has become corrupted, there is no power in the former to remove its corruptions. The hope of the Age and of pure Christianity lies in the overrulings of Him, who can make of “ a little one a thousand ; and, of a small one a strong nation ; ” and who is sure to “ hasten it in His time.”

Bow Mount, 1866.

CONTENTS.



INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

RESULT, AGENT, AND INSTRUMENT OF THE NEW BIRTH.....	17
---	----

CHAPTER II.

PREACHING, THE RIGHT HAND OF THE SPIRIT, IN WIELDING "THE SWORD OF THE WORD,"	42
--	----

CHAPTER III.

RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS.....	73
--	----

PART I.

BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

ERRONEOUS VIEWS STATED AND EXAMINED.....	111
--	-----

CHAPTER II.

CONSIDERATION OF SUGGESTIONS ARISING FROM WHAT HAS BEEN SAID.....	147
---	-----

CHAPTER III.

CONSIDERATION OF SUGGESTIONS CONTINUED.....	204
---	-----

(xv)

CHAPTER IV.

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM STATED AND ILLUSTRATED.....	270
--	-----

CHAPTER V.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.....	351
---------------------------------------	-----

PART II.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER I.

ERRONEOUS VIEWS STATED AND EXAMINED.....	393
--	-----

CHAPTER II.

REMARKS ON THE THEORY OF THE REAL PRESENCE.....	473
---	-----

CHAPTER III.

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER STATED AND ILLUSTRATED.	547
--	-----

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN'S NEW BIRTH ; ITS AGENT AND THE INSTRUMENT EMPLOYED.

AMONG the subjects, which have more or less occupied, and sometimes agitated, the mind of the Church, is that which involves the relative place and importance of *Preaching* and the Sacraments, as calling into exercise the functions of the Christian Ministry. Sometimes a question, broader in form, is asked : "What do we go to church for?" and the answer, given by the querist, is—"Not so much to hear preaching, as to worship God ;" including in the term Worship, Confession and Absolution, Prayer and Praise, Creed and Sacraments. Various periods of Church history have been marked by either a direct effort, or a silent tendency to depress preaching, and to elevate the Sacraments. Such a period has lately passed—perhaps we may regard it as still passing—over

us. If we were to believe some teachers, we should conclude that a preaching ministry is a thing of small importance ; while a ministry in Sacraments stands almost in the awful place of God, empowered to make the Body of Christ, and to offer it in continuous sacrifice for the living and the dead. In this and two following Chapters, by way of introduction to my main theme, I propose—not to enter controversially into this question, but—to seek, out of the Scriptures themselves, for the true view of the relative place and importance of Preaching and the Sacraments ; that view, which neither exalts the one, nor depresses the other, at the expense of its associate ; but which exhibits the Divine harmony between them both, as seeking and contributing to, the same great end, the salvation of lost men. The times, ecclesiastically viewed, favor the discussion. The fever of controversy has subsided ; and a cooler, calmer spirit has settled upon the Church ; so that we may hope for fitter audience now, than a few years ago, could have been expected for such discourse.

Before entering on the main inquiry, it is desirable to get a clear view of what is required in order to that great end, which is sought in common by both Preaching and the Sacraments ; in other words—of what is necessary to the salvation of lost men ; and at the same time, to obtain

a similar view of the Real Agency, by which this necessity is met, and of the Divine Instrument, employed by that agency, in meeting this necessity. These points, therefore, shall furnish subject matter for the present Chapter. They are all embraced in a passage, which will be found in the 1st Chapter of the 1st Epistle of Peter, 22d and 23d verses :

“Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the Truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart, fervently ; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.”

I. Without attempting to comment, fully and critically upon this passage, I may observe that it goes to the very Root of all Religion in man. “Unfeigned love of the brethren,” literally—Love without hypocrisy—“fervent love out of a pure heart,” this is Religion in its fairest, most perfect development on earth. Were all that claims to be religion really imbued with this spirit, Truth would have a safer as well as a warmer home, than she now has, in this lower world. Pure, holy, Christian Love furnishes no soil for the roots of error ; nor does it ever baptize Truth in the Waters of Strife.

This divine Love is the great result, at which God aims in all His Spiritual discipline of His

Earthly Children ; and when this result is reached, the soul is ripe for Heaven ; whether this result is reached in early childhood, in ripened years, or in declining age. Holy Love is no part of the process, by which we become religious ; it is Religion itself. It is most "unfeigned" and most "fervent" when the heart is purest and our whole nature most sanctified. While "obeying the Truth through the Spirit," the faithful "purify their souls unto unfeigned love of the brethren ;" and this process is sustained amid whatever hindrances, and interruptions, until, at last, they "love one another with a pure heart, fervently." We may add : the more exact they are in "obeying the Truth," the more rapid and eminent become their attainments in this unfeigned, and fervent, this holy and heavenly Love.

These remarks reveal the point of our inquiry—What is necessary to the salvation of lost man ? It is that purifying of the soul, which has its beginning in the new birth. This new birth, and the purifying, which follows it, are, in the highest sense, necessary to our enjoyment of Eternal Life. Without this great rectifying change, there can be no salvation for us, miserable sinners. Sin defiles ; and reason confirms what God has taught, that nothing defiled can enter Heaven. "There shall, in no wise, enter therein, anything that defileth,

or that worketh abomination, or a lie." Rev. 21 : 27. The soul of every man must be purified, or spend its Eternity out of Heaven ; which is but saying that, as every man is sinful, and, if he live, "commits many actual transgressions," his moral character must be radically changed, or, as the the Apostle expresses it, must be "born again of incorruptible seed ;" or, as the Apostle's Master teaches, must be "born of Water and of the Spirit," of Water which symbolizes, and of the Spirit which effects, the great necessary transformation. Moreover, being thus regenerate, the soul must grow in its new life ; must advance in sanctification ; must gain strength and stature, proportion and beauty in all the graces of a pure and spotless nature. As the Body has its birth, growth, and beautifying, so must the Soul have. In its sinful state by nature, the soul lies, as it were, in the blood and darkness of its defilements, with merely capabilities for spiritual life. Before it can actually live in holiness it must be born of the Spirit ; its inner nature, or character, must be changed, or made new. It must come to the light of a Divine life. It must be washed from the blood of its sinfulness and of its sins ; and then "as a new-born babe," in this its better life, it must "desire the sincere milk of the word, that it may grow thereby ;" grow strong and lofty, well

shaped and beauteous, in all the purities of a new and heavenly character. This must be—not because man says so, but—because God says so ; and because He speaks the decision of nothing less than His own plain, divine-eyed Reason. Even we, with nothing more than our half-blind faculty, can see that it must be so. The soul in its sins can not live a holy life ; and therefore, not a heavenly life. We may call its change by what name we please ; we may call it “Conversion,” or “Regeneration ;” the “New Birth,” or the “renewing of the mind ;” a “new creation,” or a “passing from Death unto Life ;” a “quickening from a death in trespasses and sins,” or a turning “by repentance toward God and by faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ ;” the putting on of a “wedding garment,” or the “making of a new heart and a new Spirit ;” we may call the change by what name we please, it alters not the case ; the soul must be changed, or it can never live with God in Heaven. If all the teachers on earth were to teach otherwise, this would not make it otherwise. The necessity for this change lies in the nature of things ; and the character of the immutable God and of His Eternal Truth must be altered before this necessity can cease to exist.

It is obvious that this necessary transformation is not merely superficial. The defilement of sin

is not like an unclean garment, which may at any time be thrown aside in exchange for clean apparel. It is rather like impurities in the blood, or a disease in the bones, or an inflammation of the heart, which must be cured, if cured at all, by strong, inworking medicine. The defilement of sin is in the soul itself; the soul itself, therefore, and not merely its outward habits, or dress, must be the subject of this necessary change. The soul itself must be purified and made whole of its inward Disease.

The importance of this purifying work to every individual man can not be overestimated; for, upon this depend all the results of practical religion in this life, and that holy love which is one of the most essential elements of Eternal Life itself. It must never be forgotten that this "unfeigned love of the brethren," this "love of one another with a pure heart fervently," which true Christians cultivate and exercise while "obeying the Truth through the Spirit,"—is identical in nature and origin with that pure and fervent affection, wherewith they love God, and are fitted to be forever happy in His Love. There is but One Holy Love; embracing at once, objects minute and vast, finite and infinite, man and God. We cannot love the "God manifest in Christ," without a Christian's love for man; nor can we feel a Christian's love for

man, without loving, at the same time, the Christian's God.

II. Having thus seen what is necessary to our salvation,—that purifying of the soul unto unfeigned love, which is the result and complement of the New Birth of the Spirit,—we are now ready to look at the process, by which the result is reached. I have already said that this holy and fervent love out of a pure heart, is no part of the process by which we become Religious ; but that it is Religion itself. The words of St. Peter, however, touch this process as well as the result, to which it leads. Of this process, moreover, it is important that we should have a clear conception, and a full experience ; for, upon such conceptions and experience will depend our best success in the ministry, to which we have consecrated ourselves.

“Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the Truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart, fervently ; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever ;” or perhaps, more literally, “by the Word of the living and ever enduring God.” Two things concerning the process of purifying the soul unto unfeigned love, are here

specified ; “the Spirit,” and “the Word of God ;” the Agent, and the Instrument, which he uses.

1. The Agent in the Christian’s new Birth and Sanctification. On this point all enlightened Christians are agreed. That agent is the Holy Spirit. Christians “purify their souls in obeying the Truth through **THE SPIRIT.**” He only can plant the “Incorruptible Seed,” of which they are “born again.” He is the true and only efficient cause of their new birth, and of that purifying which is its fruit.

On this point all enlightened Christians are agreed, because on this point the Bible leaves no doubt. When religious teachers speak of other things as “**SOURCES** of divine grace,”* they mean, or ought to mean, the channels through which that Grace flows, and not the fountain, from which it springs ; they refer to the visible means put into our hands, and not to the viewless First Cause, which operates through them. Of such causes, there can be but one, the Spirit of God. Our New Birth is his gift and work. Man does not regenerate and sanctify himself. By nature, he is not merely indifferent, but opposed to the change. Left wholly to his own will, he

* *Tracts for the Times.* N. Y. Ed., p. 6. Vol. I.

would always die unchanged. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh ; and these are contrary, the one to the other." Gal. 5 : 17. With this repugnance to a change so peculiar as that required in the Bible, nothing but the Holy Spirit can ever give us a new and holy nature.

In relation to this point the Bible tells us, emphatically, that they "who believe in the name of Christ," in other words, all true Christians, "are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Jno. 1 : 13. It assures us of the absolute necessity, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, of being "born of the Spirit." Jno. 3 : 5. It is the glory of the Christian Dispensation, that, while "John baptized with water," Christ was to "baptize with the Holy Ghost." Matt. 3 : 11. He specially promised to send this Divine Agent to "convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of Judgment." Jno. 16 : 8. One of the most cheering prophecies of the Old Testament is that, in which God promised to "pour out his Spirit upon all flesh." Joel, 2 : 28. Among the most cheering facts recorded in the New Testament are those, which shew that this promise has been, and is to be literally fulfilled : Acts, 2 : 1-18, while the saddest records on the sacred page are those,

in which the lost are described as having "resisted the Holy Spirit," Acts, 7 : 51, and the most solemn warnings found there are those, which exhort men "not to grieve," "not to quench," that Holy One. Eph. 4 : 30 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 19.

This point, then, is clear. To the follower of the Bible, no shade of doubt rests on it. The Holy Spirit is the only regenerator and sanctifier of the soul. Were it possible for the real child of God to deny this, even he would be a living proof of the truth, which he denied. He would carry within, however unseen or unacknowledged by himself, signatures of his "New Name ;" signatures in light, which nothing but the hand of that Holy One could have written. Such a denial, however, can never be made. Merely nominal Christians may deny it ; but not those, who are Christians in heart, as well as in name.

And yet, there is a sense, in which true Christians are to "purify their own souls." Though they cannot deny the Spirit's work, yet they must not, do not, neglect their own. The Spirit acts not on insentient, passive substances. He infuses not the new life and holiness, by quantity, into a motionless creature, as men pour clean water by measure, into a standing vessel. He acts by inclining living spirits to action. He

puts the soul in motion with new life toward growing purity, somewhat, peradventure, as a skillful master teaches a froward pupil to acquire new and useful knowledge, by awakening his natural capabilities, and by stimulating his rising desire for such knowledge. The pupil must act with the teacher, or no good result will follow. Hence, the peculiarity of the Apostle's language: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the Truth through the Spirit." Christians purify their souls through the Spirit, as the Philippians were to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling," because it was "God who wrought in them both to will and to do." Phil. 2 : 12, 13. The Spirit wrought their new life and purification ; yet they were themselves alive and active under His working. In one sense, they purified themselves. The Spirit wrought by inclining them to work. The Soul becomes holy by thinking of holiness, longing after holiness, and laboring after holiness ; but the Spirit of God moves it to think, to long, and to labor, and gives the whole its effect.

So far, then, as the Agent in our new birth and purifying is concerned, all enlightened Christians are of one mind. That Agent stands clearly revealed, the Holy Spirit of God.

2. But there is a second point in this process,

on which all Christians are not agreed ; and this point touches the Instrument, which the Spirit uses in his quickening and purifying work. The Spirit, it seems, works not without means. What is that means ? Let us approach this point thoughtfully.

If we are to believe the Apostle, the Spirit of God does his work by the Word of God. But, if by the Word of God, how, save by inclining and enabling the soul to obey the Truth of that Word ? “Ye have purified your souls in obeying the Truth ;” “born again, of incorruptible seed by the Word of God.” In obeying the Truth, the soul is purified, and Divine Love perfected. Through the Spirit, the soul obeys the Truth ; and through obedience its affections become purified and its Love grows Divine. According to this view, then, Truth is the great Instrument in the Spirit’s regenerating and purifying work. “Sanctify them through Thy Truth ; Thy Word is Truth.” John, 17 : 17. “The Sword of the Spirit is the Word of God.” Ephesians, 6 : 17. “Receive with meekness the ingrafted Word, which is able to save your souls.” James 1 : 21.

Such passages show, not only that truth is the Instrument with which the Spirit works, but also, what and where that Truth is. It is not mathematical truth, nor philosophical truth, nor physical

truth, but Truth revealed, Divine, Spiritual. It is that Holy Word, which teaches us, so far as we need it, the whole truth about God's character, the whole truth about man's condition, the whole truth about the way of Salvation, the whole truth about our religious duties, the whole truth, about all, that, as candidates for a happy eternity, we need to know. In short, as Christ is the central Sun of this whole system, and has called himself, "The Truth," as well as "The Way and The Life," so, the Truth, which the Spirit uses in His work of regenerating and purifying the soul, is that which makes truly and adequately known, the Character, Offices, and Work of this Divine Saviour, together with the Love, the homage, the whole duty which we owe Him. When the Spirit works in the soul the disposition and the power to obey this Truth, it is virtually the same thing with working in it repentance of sin, faith in Christ, submission of the whole heart to Him, and life-long love and service to His cause. It is the assigned office of the Spirit to glorify Christ, by exhibiting and applying to our minds, the powerful truths of the Gospel. He shall glorify me, for He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." Jno. 16:14. Perverters of the Gospel, are termed "False Teachers, by reason of whom, the Way of Truth is evil spoken of." 2 Pet. 2:1, 2.

The Truth, then, which the Spirit uses as his Instrument in renewing and purifying the soul, is, all that body of Spiritual light, which, centering in Christ, shines out from Christ; it is what constitutes the "shining in our hearts of the Light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," 2 Cor. 4 : 6 ; all that Truth, which shows us what God is, and what we are ; what Christ is, and what is our need of Him ; what He has done to save us, and what we must do to be saved. It is, in short, the Gospel, and the Law as preparing us for the Gospel.

How the Spirit uses this whole body of Truth in quickening and purifying the soul, is a different question, and one, with which I am not, just now, concerned. For the present, I am concerned, simply, with the Fact, that, strictly speaking, this Truth is the Instrument, and the only Instrument ; because the Church, the Ministry, the Sabbath, the Worship of God, and the Sacraments of Christ, are not, in strictness, Instruments. They are so, only as they hold THE Instrument in their hands : only so far as they are based upon, and embody the Truth, which the Spirit uses. They are but the scabbard, in which is sheathed that heaven-tempered "Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." If it were possible to unsheath that Sword, not to use it, but to throw it away ; if it were pos-

sible. in any way, to deprive the Church of the Word of God, and of all influence from that Word upon her teachings and her activities, then the Church, the Ministry, the Sabbaths, the Worship of God, and the Sacraments of Christ would be lifeless things, or filled with the life of Error, only, and the power of Death. They could exert no quickening, purifying influence over the soul. For Life and cleansing, you would go to them in vain. You might as well go for knowledge to a book, the covers of which inclosed nothing but blank leaves, without the imprint of a syllable or a letter. Except as channels, through which the Spirit brings God's Truth upon the mind, the external things of the Church are, for spiritual good, powerless. Take God's Spirit and Truth utterly away from them, and they could make no more impression on the soul, than could a man's naked hand, or a literal sword of steel. The soul cannot feel them. For good, it can feel nothing but the Truth, when it comes through them, and the Spirit when it uses that Truth.

In this strict, and only proper sense, truth is necessarily the only Instrument in the Spirit's quickening and purifying work. So far as He uses an Instrument, no agent can work on the soul for good, without Truth. Truth and Error are really the only Instruments which the soul can feel. When

one free spirit manifests itself to another, so far as to move and affect it, the power, with which it acts, is that of Truth, only, or that of Error. Truth and Error stand, to such a spirit, in the stead of physical force to brute bodies. Free spirits are separate and distinct beings, and can actuate one another only by intelligible, moral forces. They have no physical impact, like material things. They strike not ; they wield no force of sinews ; but moving in their separateness, and charged with the power of Truth only, or that of Error, they pour into each other's conscious bosoms the electricity of mutual thought, until each becomes aroused to all the vast emotions, activities and free shapings of its nature, of which they are capable.

This is the philosophy of Common Sense. Keep both Truth and Error from the human soul, and how still and stagnant it lies ! But, tell it a great Truth, truthfully, or whisper into its ear some glozing falsehood, artfully, and how quickly and mightily does it move and act ! Everything that makes the soul feel, or in any way affects her nature, is but Truth or Error, in some of their numberless forms. Goodness, love, beauty, and all other right things, which the soul feels so keenly, what are they but the Truth of character, actions and objects, to the eternal fitness of things in God ? and wickedness, injustice, deformity, and all other wrong

things, to which the soul is so livingly sensitive, what are they, but the falsehood of character, actions and objects, to that same eternal fitness? In what shape soever Truth comes, upon reaching the soul, it makes her feel and act, and thus fashions her nature. The same is true of Error, only with a contrary effect. I repeat, then, so far as he uses an Instrument, no agent can act upon the soul for good, without Truth. That agent must have Truth. In matters of Religion, without truth the soul cannot understand what God is, what sin is, what holiness is, what duty is, what the way of salvation is, what heaven is, or what is the meaning of anything religious; and until it understands what these, and kindred things are, and feels them, too, it can not believe, can not repent, can not exercise Divine love, can not perform a single holy act, can not become a renewed and purified being. There are some things which even God can not do. He can not lie. He can not do an absurdity. He can not, therefore, make the soul understand the things, which I have mentioned, without Truth; since, to understand anything without knowing the truth about that thing, is an absurdity of the grossest kind. If the Holy Spirit have not written Truth as its Instrument, it must, by special inspiration, supply an equivalent, and, by an inward miracle, teach the soul to understand, and enable it to feel,

the truth, which it brings ; or its quickening and purifying work will remain undone. But, this inward miracle, though possible with God, is yet unpromised to us. He has given us His revealed and written Truth ; this Truth He has put, as a Sword, a special Instrument, into the hand of His Spirit ; and with this His Spirit ordinarily works in quickening and purifying the Soul. Under an economy of outward means, this would seem a necessary Instrument in His work. With this only, as Resident in His Church and actually using outward means, He enlightens, quickens, purifies, strengthens, comforts, and perfects the Soul into a likeness to His own blessed Self.

Conscience has sometimes been called a Divine light, the voice of God in the soul of man ; as though this could stand in stead of revealed, or otherwise communicated truth. But, this is loose philosophy. Conscience would, more properly, be called the Eye of the Soul, with which she sees Truth ; or the Ear of the Soul, with which she hears the voice of God ; or, more properly still, the sensibility of the Soul, with which she feels the power of His Word. Strictly speaking, however, I regard Conscience as the mind itself, seeing, judging, approving and condemning its own acts ; and Truth, revealed in the written Word, or radiating from the works of God, or shining in the acts of

men, or inwardly communicated by the Spirit, as the Light, which the mind uses in thus seeing, judging, approving, and condemning its own acts. Truth is a universal language, which the soul every where can be taught to understand. Truth is a spiritual weapon, which always makes the soul feel, whenever it reaches her susceptibilities ; and the office of the Spirit is to shed light around the soul, and to heal her diseased Eye, that she may see it ; to speak the meaning of Truth to the mind, and to unstop its closed ear, that it may hear that meaning ; or to bring the weapon of Truth home to the heart, and to take off the iron-mail of prejudice, that the sensibilities may feel its piercing. In the plain terms of the Apostle's language, the office of the Spirit is, to bring the soul to "obey the Truth," that, "in obeying," it may be "purified unto unfeigned love" and every other form of holiness. The soul obeys truth, when it perceives, feels, and submits to it ; when it bows to its authority, loves its sway, and joyfully gives it governance over the thoughts and feelings, principles and purposes, motives and conduct of the mind ; and Truth, thus made effectual by the Spirit, thus revered, loved, and followed, touches every faculty of the soul, mixes remedially in all its actions, brings it right with God, and right with man, works off its impurities, excites love,

and brings back to man, the lost tempers of Heaven.

It may, indeed, be inquired : "How does the Holy Spirit, in the process thus unfolded, open the blinded eye of the soul, that it may be conscious of the presence of Truth, as a spiritual light ; or unstop its deafened Ear, that it may hear the meaning of that Truth when presented ; or soften its hardened heart, that it may feel the power of that truth, when urged ? Is not here a work upon the soul, which the Spirit must perform, before it can use the Instrument of Truth, in carrying on its further work ? And must it not, therefore, do this previous work without an instrument ?"

This is inquiring deeply ; perhaps beyond the power of a demonstrative reply. And yet, I see not that this first act of the Spirit must be performed without an Instrument ; but I can see that it may be performed by the Instrumentality of that very truth, which is afterwards to be so effectively used. If we must use a figure, why may not Truth be called, in reference to this first work, a couching Instrument, used by the Spirit in removing the film from the eye of the soul, that she may be conscious of the light of Truth ; or the point to the "Sword of the Spirit," used in piercing the dullness of her ear, that she may hear the meaning of Truth ; or as a fire from the altar,

melting the hardness of her heart, that she may feel the power of Truth? Evidently the Divine Agent may use the Instrument of Truth in this His first act, as well as in any, or every further operation. The essence of Truth is Spiritual. It is not black ink, or red ink, imprinted on paper. We may almost conceive of essential Truth as a live thing; and we may well regard it as a kind of ethereal atmosphere, in which even the Holy Spirit cannot move, without putting it in motion. Divine Truth is what the Spirit utters; what He utters is to be understood; and when He utters it, He also makes the Deaf to hear, and the hearing to understand. "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth," was the language of young Samuel, after God had spoken thrice before. 1 Sam. 3 : 9, 10. "When they heard this they were pricked in their heart," was the experience of the three thousand, to whom Peter preached the Gospel on the day of Pentecost, and whose hard hearts were pierced by what they heard. Acts, 2 : 37.

I have thought it desirable to dwell the longer on this point, because it has an important bearing on what I have to say of the subject of preaching and the Sacraments, as related to the end of man's salvation. The application of what has been said to that subject, I will not, at present, anticipate. I will only add in this place, that the relation,

which has been indicated, between Truth and the Holy Spirit on the one hand, and the soul of man on the other, is most important. It plainly shows us why, in saving the souls of men, the Church is more gloriously successful in one place, or at one time, than another. It is because, in such places, and at such times, she has more holy truth, with less mixture of error, than at others, in her preaching and sacraments, in her doctrines and worship. If Truth be the only instrument, with which the Spirit quickens and purifies the soul, then all Truth, so far as Revelation has made it known, is important ; and not a ray of its light may be safely or guiltlessly turned aside, or hidden from the eye of the mind. The Church, which has Truth in her Standards, yet corrupted by a mixture of error, or covered under a pall of superstition, can hope for little, if any success in saving men. Where Truth is latent, or error mostly visible, the soul can receive little or nothing, but damage. Error is the Instrument, which the Spirit of Evil uses, in deforming and destroying the soul, in polluting and filling it with enmity to God. Where there is no holy Truth, the soul lies dead in her blood, and uncleanness. But when such truth prevails, where it is free from mixtures of error, and where it is simply and adequately exhibited in the ministry and services of the Church,

there true conversions abound, and the souls of a great multitude are seen, washed from the guilt of their transgressions, made alive unto God, and clothed in the garments of beautiful holiness.

The points, which have now been reviewed, may well be kept in mind : 1. The soul of every man must be quickened, and purified from its death in trespasses and sins, or it can never be happy with God : 2. The Holy Spirit is the Sole Agent, by which this quickening and purifying can be effected ; 3. Divine Truth is the only Instrument, which He uses in His work, save as other means are subsidiary to His use of that ; nor may we safely forget that, in speaking of the Holy Spirit, the human soul and Divine Truth, we are speaking, not of blocks and brutes, but of living and life-giving things ; and that, therefore, the whole subject devolves on us the duties of prayer and watchfulness, of labor and study, of thought and effort, to see that these living and life-giving things be not kept apart. It is only by keeping the Spirit, the Truth, and the Soul in close companionship, that we can expect the blessed result of quickened and purified natures. Indolence and indifference here are as deeply mischievous, and, in one sense, as deeply criminal, as dislike and opposition. Though the Spirit is always first in action in the great work,

which has been considered, yet we should always labor as earnestly as if first action belonged to us ; and though God will ever be found to have wrought all our good in us, yet we should always work as if there were a sense, in which all things depend on ourselves.

CHAPTER II.

PREACHING THE RIGHT HAND OF THE SPIRIT, IN WIELDING "THE SWORD OF THE WORD."

WITH evident reference to its use in slaying the enmity of the heart, and in subduing the hostility of the world, "The Word of God" is called the "Sword of the Spirit." If, then; the question were asked ; with what visible hand does the Spirit wield this Instrument of heavenly temper ? all enlightened Christians would doubtless answer : "with the hand of an authorized ministry of living men." And this hand has been kindly, as well as wisely chosen. It is better than would have been the hand of Angels. Taught by the Spirit to know himself, man knows, by analogy, his fellow-man, and can approach him without that overwhelming awe, with which, as we occasionally see in the Bible, he would be struck by the ministry of more mysterious natures. The ministry of living men has always been in use under every Dispensation of the Church ; and is especially characteristic of it under its Christian name. It is this ministry, which

now appears visibly in filling the Sabbaths, the worship, and the Sacraments of the Church with a kind of life and motion. Take this ministry away, and all these channels would be empty, or filled with merely motionless truth. Every Christian, indeed, is in one sense a Minister of Christ ; and may read and talk of the things revealed ; and may pray with his fellows, as well as in secret. Some hold that the private Christian may even administer the Sacraments ; especially, in the absence of the ministry. But, without this ministry, the Spirit would have no commissioned hand to be used in bringing God's Word into action through its appropriate channels.

But when we come to ask another question ; ' Was this visible ministry appointed to bring Truth into operation mainly through the Sacraments, or chiefly through Preaching ? ' we do not find the same harmony of opinion. In speaking of these visible channels, through which the Spirit brings the Truth into contact with the mind, there are some who teach that " the Sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine grace : " * that " the great work, " which Christians did at first, " Every Lord's Day, " was " to administer and receive Christ's mystical Body and blood ; " (Bp. Bev. quoted by Tracts, p.

* Tracts for the Times. N. Y. Ed., p. 6. Vol. I.

175) and that "this is the great means, appointed by our Blessed Redeemer, whereby to communicate Himself and all the merits of His most precious Death and Passion to us, for the pardon of all our sins, and for the purifying of our consciences from dead works, to serve the living God." (*Ibid.* p. 189, 190).

But, to us, this sounds more like the extreme of a human theory, than the teaching of the Word of God. To our apprehension, this Word makes the preaching of the gospel, rather than the administration of the Sacraments, the very right hand of the Spirit, in wielding the Sword of the Word for the salvation of men.

To ascertain, however, which of these views is the more correct, let us go "to the Law and to the Testimony."

I. We take up, first, the case of the SACRAMENTS. What is the language of the Bible when speaking of these as the work of the ministry?

1. AS TO BAPTISM ; we find it instituted, enjoined and practiced ; but, to all appearance, we find it thus presented as an ordinance, which was to follow the preaching of the Gospel, and the conversion, thereby, of the souls of men to the faith of Christ. "Preach the Gospel to every creature : he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16 : 15, 16. Here, evidently, is the Divinely indi-

cated order in the work of the ministry : 1. Preaching the Gospel ; 2. Its Effect,—conversion unto faith ; 3. Baptism, the outward expression of that Effect. And this Order the first Ministers of Christ appear to have uniformly followed. Hence, when “ Philip went to the City of Samaria and preached Christ unto them,” it is said : “ When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.” Acts, 8 : 5, 12. In the case of the Eunuch, too, the same Evangelist first “ opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture” which had been read “ and preached unto him Jesus ;” then he demanded and obtained of him a profession of his faith in Christ ;* and finally, “ he baptized him.” Acts, 8 : 35, 37, 38. Again ; when Peter first carried the Gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles, he began with “ preaching peace by Jesus Christ ;” assuring them that “ through His name, whosoever believeth on Him, shall receive remission of sins ;” and when his preaching had been blessed to their conversion, he inquired, “ Can any man forbid Water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we ?” Then “ he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” Acts,

* The genuineness of this clause in the passage, is by some doubted.

10, *passim*. Lydia, also, of Thyatira, first heard Paul and Timothy preach the Gospel ; then “ the Lord opened her heart to attend to the things which were spoken ; ” and finally, being a true convert, “ she was baptized. ” Acts, 16 : 14, 15. Again ; Paul and Silas, singing praises unto God at the midnight hour in their prison, when the anxious jailor of Philippi came in with the inquiry : “ Sirs, what must I do to be saved ? ” replied ; “ Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house. Then spake they unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house ; ” and “ believing in God with all his house, he was baptized, he and all his, straightway. ” Acts, 16 : 30–34. Once more ; when Peter had preached his first sermon, and when the multitude, who “ were pricked in their heart, said unto him and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, what shall we do ? ” he answered, “ Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. ” “ Then they, that gladly received his word, were baptized ; and the same day there were added to them, about three thousand souls. ” Acts, 2 : 37, 38, 41. And, to add but this ; when Saul of Tarsus had seen a vision of his persecuted Lord, he must needs be sent to Damascus and listen to the preaching of Ananias, before, in the Waters of Baptism, he visibly sealed the faith, to

which he had been converted, and thus openly consecrated himself to the service of Jesus of Nazareth. Acts, 22 : 10-16.

There are many other references to the practice of Baptism ; but none to affect the view here taken, that Baptism is an Ordinance, designed to follow the preaching of the Gospel, and the conversion thereby of the souls of men to the faith of Christ.

It may, indeed, be objected that these remarks apply to the baptism of adults, only ; and that, in the case of infants, the order of events is changed ; and this is true, so far as the OUTWARD order of events is concerned. Infants are incapable of receiving a Gospel preached unto repentance and faith. To them, Baptism is a token that they are the seed of a professedly believing people ; it admits them into the visible Church ; it seals to them, conditionally, the promises of God ; it places them, educationally, amid the outward privileges and means of Grace ; it represents to them that they need the quickening and cleansing influences of the Spirit ; and it binds them, with opening accountability, to seek those influences, and to become what their Baptism teaches they should be, "dead unto sin, and alive unto righteousness." Hence, when they "come to years of discretion," the Church still "calls upon

them to hear Sermons," the preaching of the Gospel ; and "chiefly provides that they should learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and all the other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health." (Office Infant Bap.) And hence, when effectually brought to this knowledge and faith, the Church calls on them, in a sort of second Baptism, "openly to ratify and confirm what has previously been done in their name." The principle in question, therefore, remains unaffected, and the INWARD order unchanged. The preaching of the gospel, or some equivalent inculcation of its truths, in riper years, is as much an antecedent to their conversion, as it is to the great body of unbaptized adults, to whom Christ's ministers are commissioned to carry the Gospel. In either case, the preaching of the Gospel, in some way, is evidently the great instrument of the really effected New Birth of the Spirit ; and in both cases, Baptism has the same signification and effect, as an ordinance, admitting to membership in the Church, sealing the promises of God, and binding to obedience of life. Even in Infant Baptism, the ministry of the Word holds priority in point of efficacy, as the means, by which the Spirit quickens and purifies the soul, and brings it to a fitness openly and intelligently to confess Christ before men.

2. Of **THE LORD'S SUPPER** less is said in the Bible than of Baptism. Three of the writers of the Gospels record the facts of its first institution, and of its being enjoined on the disciples as a memorial of Christ, and as a Sacred Symbol of His atoning Sacrifice. Matt. 26 ; Mark, 14 ; Luke, 22. The Apostle Paul records the revelation, special to himself, of the same facts. 1 Cor. 11 : 23-26. He also sharply reproves the Corinthians for their shocking abuse of this Sacrament, and gives them suitable instructions for its decent observance. 1 Cor. 11 : 17-34. Moreover, he defines the act of administering this Sacrament, as "the Cup of blessing, which we bless," "the Bread which we break ;" and that of receiving it as "the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." 1 Cor. 10 : 16. And finally, he shows the utter inconsistency of "drinking the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils," and of being "partakers of the Lord's Table, and the table of devils." 1 Cor. 10 : 21. In addition to this, there are three probable incidental allusions to the observance of this Sacrament during the Apostles' times ; one, in the case of Christ and the two disciples at Emmaus ; if that may be called an instance of its observance ; another, in the case of the three thousand, converted under the first preaching of Peter ; and another, in the case of

Paul and the church at Troas, in connection with the death and recovery of Eutychus.

This, so far as I can collect, is the whole of what is said of this Sacrament in the New Testament ; enough, certainly, to evince the divine origin, high obligation, and deep importance of the Lord's Supper ; and to prove, that, by the early Christians, it was an ordinance, frequently, perhaps regularly observed ; and yet, going no further than to show that, in its leading design, this Ordinance is Love's memorial and Faith's reception of the Death of Christ ; that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are Symbols, ministerially set apart, of Christ's Body and blood as a Sacrifice for Sin ; and that, to abuse this ordinance, in a profane way, or without discerning by faith the Lord's Body, which it symbolizes, is to eat and drink, not with a blessing, but, unto condemnation.

I enter, now, into no examination of the sense of the important passages, to which I have referred. Such an examination belongs to another part of the discussion. For the present, I content myself with saying that, rightly understood, I think those passages will not be found to suggest the conclusion, that Christ and His Apostles relied on this Sacrament for the conveyance of that pardon which was purchased by His Death, or that they relied on this Sacrament mainly for giving

effect to His propitiatory sacrifice. On the contrary, understood in their true sense, they will be found full of meaning to this effect ; that its Institutor and His first ministers considered it an ordinance, in which true Christians only are to commune profitably together by faith, and happily together in love, upon the consecrated symbols and memorials of the Saviour's Body and blood ; that, having previously, by "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," become participants in the pardon of sin and in the hope of eternal life, as revealed in the Gospel, such Christians come together in the Lord's Supper, to express their faith in Christ, and their love for Him, and in the exercise of these graces, to be refreshed and "strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inner man," while feeding spiritually on "the true Bread which came down from heaven."

II. Having thus seen what is said of the Sacraments, let us now see what is said of **PREACHING**, as a part of the great work of the Ministry.

1. What, then, is the meaning of the fact, that Christ is Himself, by emphasis, the **LOGOS**, "the **WORD**" ? Does it not mean that as he was "the Word," uttered, as it were, from the very heart and substance of the Father, so the Word, preached, uttered from His own heart and from the heart

and mouth of His ministers, is, when rendered efficacious by the power of the Holy Ghost, the divinely appointed means of quickening and purifying unto eternal life the souls of the "dead in trespasses and sins?"

2. Confirmatory of the meaning thus suggested is the fact, that His own ministry was eminently a ministry of **PREACHING** the Gospel. It was by this that He prepared His disciples to understand and receive the offering of Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. In this work of Sacrifice, indeed, lies the burden of the Gospel; and yet, in consummating this Work itself, He spent but a few hours, while, in preparing His disciples for it, by preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, he consumed years. From the time of His entrance on His ministry, "Jesus began to preach and to say: Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Matt. 4: 17. It was as true of the whole sphere of His ministry, as it was of the particular parts mentioned, that "Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in the synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom." Matt. 4: 23. When He "departed" from one place, it was "to teach and preach in the rest of their cities." Matt. 11: 1. To His disciples He said: "Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also; for therefore came I forth." Mark, 1: 38. And when

he came into the Synagogue of Nazareth, and made His disciples "wonder at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth," it was by simply preaching a Sermon on that beautiful prophecy of Himself by Isaiah : "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel unto the poor ; He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, and to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind ; to set at liberty them that are bruised ; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." Luke, 4 : 18, 19.

3. As a further confirmation, we have the fact, that the Twelve were chosen to be with Him "from the beginning," in order that, by listening to His preaching, and being eye-witnesses to His miracles and passion, they might HAVE A GOSPEL to preach ; and, when endowed by the Spirit, be qualified to become, in their turn, preachers of the very Gospel which they had been taught, and which they had received. Hence He says : "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you, from the Father, He shall testify of Me ; and ye, also, shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning." John, 15 : 26, 27. The season, which they spent with Him, was the term of their Theological education ; of their acquisition of knowledge and their investment with the Spirit,

in order to their successful witnessing for Christ, both in their future preaching of the Gospel, and in their future suffering for the Gospel.

4. As a still further confirmation, we have the fact, that the various commissions from Christ, which the Apostles received, were chiefly commissions to GO AND PREACH THE GOSPEL. Thus ran the high mandates under which they went forth.

First: the commission "ordained twelve, that they might be with Jesus, and that He might send them forth to preach and to have power to heal sickness and to cast out Devils." Mark, 3 : 14, 15 ; Luke, 6 : 13. Here, evidently, their chief, as well as their first work was preaching. Miracles could have been no more than an occasional incident by the way.

Second: the commission next emphasized the priority of preaching. "Go ye to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and as ye go, preach, saying: the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye on the house-tops." "Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of Judgment, than for that city." Matt. 10 : 7-27. In this, as

in their first commission, was included the temporary power of working miracles ; but as in the former case, such working could have been but an incident by the way ; their main business was, " the preaching of the Kingdom." Luke, 9 : 2.

Third : the commission, as finally given, retains this place of primacy to preaching. Given after the Resurrection, this must be supposed to bear the full evangelical type. Thus, then, it runs : " All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth ; go ye therefore, and TEACH ALL NATIONS ; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you ; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28 : 18-20. Or, as it is expressed by St. Mark : " Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; and he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark, 16 : 15, 16. To this, the last, the finished form of their commission, it is immediately added by way of historical comment : " And they went forth, and PREACHED EVERYWHERE ; the Lord working with them and confirming the Word by signs following." Mark, 16 : 20.

5. This comment introduces a still further confirmatory fact. Let us weigh it a little more care-

fully. After their Master had given their commission its widest scope and most divine fullness, and had dropped from His ascending form on their office the broad mantle of His own authority ; they and their coadjutors immediately gave themselves to the EXECUTION of that commission by THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL. To this, emphatically, Peter and John, Stephen and Philip, Paul and Barnabas, Apollos "Mighty in the Scriptures," and the multitude dispersed by early persecution, devoted their powers, "rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His name ; and daily, in the Temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." Yea, "they went everywhere, preaching the Word." Acts, 5 : 41, 42 ; 8 : 4.

It is important to remark, that while thus engaged, the incidents, which happened to them, and their manner of meeting those incidents, showed the estimate, in which they held their office, and the interpretation, which they put on their commission. Scarcely had they entered on their work, when, on one occasion, they were thrown into prison for their boldness in preaching Christ. But the Angel of the Lord, having opened their prison door, said unto them, "Go ; stand and speak in the Temple to the people, all the words of this Life." And they went and spake. Immediately,

however, they were dragged before the Council, and asked : “ Did we not straightly command you that ye should not teach in this name ? And behold ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.” But to this, their heroic reply was : “ We ought to obey God rather than men ;” and with that, they instantly began to preach Jesus in the very audience of their persecutors ; and when they had been beaten for so doing, “ they departed from the presence of the Council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His Name ; and daily, in the Temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.” Acts, 5, *passim*.

On another occasion, when they found lesser duties too engrossing on their time, they appointed subordinate ministers for such things ; and then “ gave themselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word.” Acts, 6 : 4.

And on another occasion still, when the multitude, “ unable to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit, by which he spake,” had “ stoned Stephen,” and thus began to roll the first wave of general persecution over the Infant Church ; “ those that were scattered abroad, went everywhere preaching the Word.” Acts, 8 : 4.

In all these incidents, and in the manner, in which they were met, it is manifest that the bur-

den of the labors of all His first ministers was—what we should naturally expect from the tenor of their commission—not the administration of the Sacraments, but the preaching of “Jesus Christ and Him Crucified.” The body of their history is, in fact, found in the following brief record: “And they, when they had testified and preached the Word of the Lord, returned to Jerusalem, and preached the Gospel in many villages of the Samaritans.” Acts, 8: 25. That “the breaking of bread,” or celebration of the Lord’s Supper, was frequent in the first Christian assemblies, we need not deny; Acts, 2: 42; but there can be no doubt that the main course of their ministry lay thus: first, bringing men to “repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;” and, when they were thus gathered into Christian assemblies, then, the drawing close of the bonds of brotherly love, and of holy union by frequently communing together over the hallowed memorials of that Crucified Master, to whom they had given their faith, and whom, though in the face of persecution and death, they were determined to serve. By the “ministry of the Word” they were brought to the Saviour; by the “communion of Saints” they were strengthened to constancy amid the kindling fires of persecution.

6. But in addition to all these facts, confirma-

tory of the view thus taken, there are various passages both from Christ and from His Apostles, which intensify the light hitherto elicited.

(1.) Thus, when announcing the permanent work of His Ministry, and foretelling even the end of the world, Christ says, "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations ; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24 : 14. Other things, besides this preaching of the Gospel, were to be done during this long period ; and things of great importance, too ; but, in thus condensing the entire history of His Church into a single sentence, this was so much the most important of all, that it seemed to be the only thing worthy of introduction into such a summary.

(2.) Again ; after His resurrection, and the giving of His final commission, in explaining to His disciples "Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms," and in "opening their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures," He said unto them : "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day ; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name, among all nations." Luke, 24 : 44-47. Suffering for sin was the great fact of His labors. Preaching that fact unto repentance and remission of sins was to be the

great work of His ministers. To this end, they were "endued with power from on high." Luke 24 : 49; and, to make them skillful in their work, "their understandings were opened, that they might understand the Scriptures," and that thus they might know how to preach Him whom the Scriptures revealed. And yet, the theory of some would have Christ, while setting forth His chief act, and the great work of His Ministers, to speak thus : "Offering the first sacrifice for sin has been the burden of My labors; continuing this sacrifice in the mystery of the altar is to be yours." It is enough to say ; Christ did not so interpret his own meaning. His interpretation runs thus : "My propitiatory suffering for sin is the most vital fact in the Gospel-system : your great labor will be—the preaching of this fact and of its dependent truths for the conversion and salvation of sinners."

(3.) In passing, now, from the view which Christ gave of this point to that which His Apostles took, I notice first the address of St. Paul to the elders of the Church of Ephesus assembled at Miletus. This was a peculiarly solemn occasion. It was near the close of the Apostle's labors; and he improved it to the affecting purpose of showing that He had made "full proof of His Ministry;" that no one could charge Him with the death of a single soul; but that the skirts of His robes of office had been

washed "clean from the blood of all." On such an occasion, then, what does he say? Take a few of many pregnant expressions. "I kept back nothing that was profitable; but have showed you and taught you publicly, and from house to house; testifying, both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things which shall befall me there, save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying, that bonds and afflictions abide me. But, none of these things move me; neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received from the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. Wherefore, I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts, 20: 20-27. This is a specimen of His whole address; in which, from beginning to end, there is not a word about his having ever administered a single Sacrament. The truth is, he had been so mainly occupied, throughout his ministry with its great ordained labor, that now, when standing, as it were, at the

foot of the Judgment Seat, and amid the most affecting anticipations of his final account, he could only pour out his thoughts on what had so long and so thoroughly engrossed them, "the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God."

(4.) Again ; his demonstration to the Romans of the necessity of preaching is equally in point. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on Him, in whom they have not believed ; and how shall they believe in Him, of whom they have not heard ? And how shall they hear without a preacher ? And how shall they preach, except they be sent ? As it is written : How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things ! So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Rom. 10 : 13-15, 17.

How different is this from the teaching that whosoever, not in mortal sin, shall partake of the sacrifice of the Altar, with faith to believe that Christ's Body is there, shall be saved ! The Apostle taught a more Evangelical scheme. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, with the faith necessary to such calling, shall be saved." To this prayer of faith a knowledge of Christ is, of course, necessary ; and to this knowledge, the preaching

of the Gospel, or some equivalent inculcation of the Word of God, is essential. Here is not a word about the necessity of the Sacraments to Salvation. The Sacraments are necessary "where they may be had," and to the end designed in them ; but not essentially and absolutely necessary to Salvation. Hence, the pre-eminent importance of the Ministry of the Word.

(5.) To the same effect is the teaching of the Apostle to the Corinthians : "To wit ; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them ; and hath committed unto us the Word of Reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us. We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin ; that we might be made the Righteousness of God in Him." 2 Cor. 5 : 19-21. This is one of the happiest summaries on record of the true Gospel of our Redemption ; one of the best statements to be found of the true character of the ministry ; and one of the most felicitous specimens, to be met with, of the manner, in which the ministry should be exercised. According to this summary, the Gospel is "God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their ~~transgressions~~ unto them." According to the statement follow-
trespasses

ing, the ministry "are Ambassadors for Christ," charged with the "Word of Reconciliation," the message and terms of pardon and life ; and according to the specimen given, the best manner of exercising this ministry lies, in urging God's beseeching call, and praying men "for Christ's sake, to be reconciled to Him," as the most effectual way of bringing them to realize, amid the tenderness of Repentance, and the actings of faith, this vital truth, that God "hath made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him." Precious Gospel ! A reconciling God in Christ ! Solemn ministry ! Ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech by us ! Touching discharge of that high function ! Pleading with men for Jesus' sake to be reconciled to Him, against whom they had rebelled, but who still seeks to cover them, through faith in the Crucified, with the Rich Robe of His own perfect Righteousness ! Would to God that the ministry had never, in any case, lost the spirit of this marvelous passage !

(6.) The language of the Apostle to the Corinthians, in another place, is similarly pertinent. "Though ye have ten thousand Instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers ; for, in Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the Gospel." 1 Cor. 4:15. Here the whole order,

work and result of the ministry are given in brief, but deeply significant summary. "In Christ Jesus," who giveth the Spirit, and whom the Spirit glorifieth, in Christ Jesus, Paul, the living preacher, had "begotten" children to their new birth "through the Gospel," as the Divinely Appointed Instrument of their quickening and purifying change "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

(7.) But perhaps the most remarkable language on this point, as illustrating both the necessity and the power of preaching, when considered as the right hand of the Spirit in wielding the Sword of the Word, is that addressed to the Corinthians in another place: "Christ sent me, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel;" that is, preaching the Gospel is the main item in my commission; preaching the Gospel, "not with wisdom of words, lest the Cross of Christ should be made of no effect. For the preaching of the Cross is—to them that perish—foolishness: but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written: I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nought the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the Scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For, after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased

God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom. But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks, foolishness ; but unto them, which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling brethren, *τὴν κλήσιν ὑμῶν*, how that not many wise men, after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called ; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world," what the world calls " the foolishness of preaching." (v. 21.) " to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty ; and the base things of the world, and things that are despised, hath God chosen ; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are ; that no flesh should glory in His presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who, of God, is made unto us Wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption ; that, according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1 Cor. 1 : 17-31.

Now, it must be remembered that the whole of this magnificent passage is spoken of the preaching of the Cross, in distinction from the administering

of Sacraments ; and is, therefore, strictly to our purpose. This preaching, the Apostle styles “ the foolishness of preaching ;” “ the foolish things of the world ;” “ the weak things of the world ;” nay ; by one of the most startling of figures, “ the foolishness of God,” and “ the weakness of God ;” in reference to the estimate put by the self-conceited philosophers and great ones of that age, upon the Cross of Christ, and those who preached it.

If I might venture to do so, I would change one expression in our English version ; I refer to the words, “ are called,” in v. 26. By referring to the Greek, it will be seen that these are not in the original. In filling the blank, it would seem to be required by the scope of the writer, to substitute, not the words, “ are called,” but some other. Thus ; “ Ye see your calling, brethren ; how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble,” *have been employed* ; “ but God hath” used other instruments ; a despised and crucified Christ, and the despised and persecuted preachers of His Cross. He hath not employed men of learning, men of power, men of rank, in calling you ; nor any of the applauded systems of worldly philosophy ; but He hath chosen rather the contemned Gospel of the Crucified ; and the slighted preachers of His Cross, the unlearned, the unendowed, the untitled, like Peter and James and

John ; and He has done this for the very purpose of "staining the pride of all glory" in man ; of showing that the work of saving sinners does not depend for success on human learning, greatness, or nobility, but on the power of God, as it resides in the Mighty Doctrine of the Cross.

Thus rendered, the whole passage is still more pertinent to my purpose ; while this rendering gives the Greek word, *κλησις*, its usual and proper active sense, equivalent to the Latin substantive, *vocatio*, and the English participle, *calling* ; "Ye see your calling, brethren ;" i. e. not "your being called," but "the calling of you ;" *τὴν κλησιν ὑμῶν*.

I am aware that Schleusner, with others, thinks *κλησις* may be used in a passive sense, for *κλητὸς*, *vocatus*, being called ; and he cites this very place in St. Paul as an instance of such use. To this, he may have been led, by the fact that, in the 24th v. believers in Christ are termed, passively, *κλητοὶς*, "those who are called." But I see no reason why, because believers are termed, passively, *κλητοὶ*, the usually active *κλησις* should here be considered as used passively ; especially, when its usual active force gives us a good and even a better sense.

But, let this particular word be understood in either sense, nothing can break the force of the Apostle's striking language throughout the pas-

sage, which has been read ; or materially add to the weight of his strong, ponderous meaning. I have given the passage entire, because it cannot be divided without breaking its force in demonstrating the pre-eminent honor which God has put upon the Cross of Christ, and the ordinance of preaching, and in illustrating the reverent estimate, in which He would have us hold that ordinance, as what I must repeatedly term, the Right hand of the Spirit in wielding the Sword of His Word.

There are other passages* of equal pertinency to the same point ; many of them, indeed, of unsurpassed force ; but they are too numerous for citation and comment. I close, therefore, with a few remarks, on what has been said.

The principal results, which have thus far been reached, are these two : 1, that the Sacraments were evidently intended, not for the instrumental origination of the new life in the soul, and the conveyance of pardon and justification, but, for administration to those, who, through the preaching of the Gospel, made effectual by the Spirit, had been previously brought to repentance and faith ; or, who, if infants, are, in baptism, placed amid the

* *Vid.*, 1 Cor. 2: 1-7; 9: 16; 15: 1, 2; 2 Cor. 4: 1-7; Gal. 1: 6-9; Eph. 6: 19, 20; Phil. 1: 14-19; Col. 1: 24-29; 1 Thess. 2: 4-13; 2 Thess. 3: 1; 1 Tim. 2: 6, 7; 2 Tim. 1: 11; 2: 15; 3: 16, 17; 4: 1-5; Tit. 1: 9-11; Jan. 1: 21-25; 1 Pet. 1: 22-25; Rev. 14: 6, *et alii*.

means of their subsequent quickening unto newness of life and godliness ; and 2, that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ crucified, in season and out of season, with boldness and fidelity, in love and long-suffering, and in the face of persecution and death, was the one mighty labor, to which the first ministers of Christ were devoted, and in which they wore out their lives for the conversion and salvation of their fellow men.

And, since the character and objects of the ministry have not since been changed, it is evident that the theory, which makes "the Sacraments, not preaching, the Sources of Divine Grace," is unscriptural. Nor, in saying this, do we detract from the value of the Sacraments themselves, or from that profound reverence and affection with which they should ever be regarded, as the ordinances of Christ. On this point, however, I shall speak more fully in the next Chapter.

For the present, we may well bless God for the Gospel, which he hath sent us, and for that ministry of living men in the preaching of the Gospel, through which the Holy Spirit quickens the dead unto newness of life, and purifies the soul unto "unfeigned love." In this preaching, now, as of old, heavenly influences meet men. Sacred, though viewless realities are about those who receive the "preaching of Christ crucified ! God — Father,

Son and Spirit—is seeking their salvation. And eternal Life, or everlasting Death, hangs on the manner in which they are affected by His seeking. May none “receive this Grace of God in vain ;” but may all so yield to it, that the “preaching of the Cross” may prove to them neither “a stumbling-block,” nor “foolishness,” but “the power of God and the Wisdom of God.”

CHAPTER III.

RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS.

I HAVE already remarked, that the most vital fact in the Gospel is, the Sacrifice, which Christ perfected on the Cross as an atonement for sin. This was the sublime consummation, without which he had left the bosom of the Father in vain. "It behooved Christ to suffer." Teaching, alone, could not have redeemed a world. "The cup which the Father had given" the Son "to drink," could "not pass away." It was necessary that Jesus should exhaust it, or leave his design of mercy unaccomplished.

To this work of atonement by Sacrifice, both of the Christian Sacraments have an admitted reference. In the former we are represented as "baptized into His Death." Rom. 6 : 3. That is, Baptism teaches, in emblem, what the Sacrifice of Christ requires of us, "a death unto Sin, and a new birth unto Righteousness." Baptism teaches what

the death of Christ requires should be spiritually wrought in the Sinner.

In the latter Sacrament, we are represented as having "the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." 1 Cor. 10 : 16. The Lord's Supper is a Divine Symbol of the Sacrifice of Atonement. It teaches that, "without the shedding of blood is no remission." This Sacrament shows what Christ, by His death, has graciously done for the sinner.

Thus far, all rightly instructed Christians agree. Whatever else or more there may be in the Sacraments, all such Christians agree that they contain, at least, the force of signification, here ascribed to them. Difference arises on another point. Did Christ intend to give effect to His work of atonement, in other words, did he design to generate the new life in the Soul ; to bring us to the grace and realization of pardon, justification, and adoption ; and to communicate to us the rich benefits of His Death and passion ; did He design to do these things by the gift of His Spirit in the use of His Sacraments, or through the Preaching of the Cross ?

In discussing this important question, I have been led to see, not in the Sacraments, primarily and mainly, but, in the preaching of the Gospel, the very right hand of the Spirit in wielding the Sword of the Word ; not merely because this is the

view of pious and learned men in the Church, but because this is the view given by the Bible itself. I have shown that, in the Christian Scriptures, the main stress in the work of saving men is laid on preaching ; whether we look at Christ's own ministry, at His various commissions to the Twelve, at their action under those commissions, or at the language of the inspired writers when speaking of the Sacraments and of preaching, whether separately or in connection. As Christ's great, though not solitary act was the making of an Atonement for sin, so the chief, though not the only work of His ministers was to be a proclamation of that Atonement ; or, as the Apostle terms it, "the preaching of the Cross ;" the "preaching of Jesus Christ and Him Crucified." The ministry itself is termed "the ministry of Reconciliation," or, the Reconciling Ministry ; evidently as having been commissioned to preach "the Word of reconciliation," or the Reconciling Word. Christ's Ministers themselves are denominated "Ambassadors for Christ," not Sacrificers at His Altar ; and their work is described, not as "making the Bread and Wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ," but, as praying men, in Christ's stead, as though God did beseech us, by them, to be reconciled to Him.

I. In continuing this discussion, my first remark is, that the History of the Church corroborates the

view which has been taken. After the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit, we find that, whenever the ordinance of preaching was most faithfully used and most fully enjoyed, there were most abundantly exhibited the results of repentance and faith ; all the fruits of an effectual "laying hold of that eternal life," which is in Christ Jesus.

1. Look, first, at Apostolic times.

When Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them, "they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, and were baptized, both men and women." Acts, 8 : 5, 12. The same effect followed Peter's preaching in the house of Cornelius, when the first Gentile congregation were "present before God, to hear all things commanded of God." "While Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the Word." Acts, 10 : 33, 44. More remarkable still, were the effects of Peter's first sermon to a congregation of Jews. While Peter preached the Word, the silent power of the Spirit "pricked" the hearts of the multitude ; and "the same day, there were added" to the saved, "about three thousand souls." Acts, 2 : 41. Similar facts are repeatedly mentioned in the Apostolic records. Thus, immediately after the Apostles had decided that it was not reasonable for them to "leave the

Word of God and serve tables," and had resolved to "give themselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the Word;" we find that, in its fruits, "the Word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient unto the faith." Acts, 6: 2, 4, 7. Thus, too, when "by the space of three years," Paul had been preaching the Gospel at Ephesus, "so that all they that dwelt in Asia heard the Word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks;" when the evil spirits had shamed the "vagabond exorcists," who presumed to adjure them by that "Jesus, whom Paul preached;" when the "many, that believed, came and confessed and showed their evil deeds;" and when the "many also of them which used curious arts, brought their books together and burned them before all," to the value of "fifty thousand pieces of silver;" we have the strikingly illustrative comment of the Sacred historian: "So mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed." Acts, 19: 1-20 *passim*.

It is remarkable that, while all the passages, thus referred to, speak, directly, of preaching as the means used by the Spirit in producing these great results, the Scriptures never once allude to the Sacraments as instrumental in such effects! And yet, Bp. Beveridge, in his "Sermon on Fre-

quent Communion," has attempted to show that, at first, the Lord's Supper was administered daily, or at least every Lord's Day ; and that " this is the great means, appointed by our blessed Redeemer, whereby to communicate Himself, and all the merits of His most precious death and passion," " for the pardon of all our sins, and for the purifying of our consciences from dead works to serve the living God." As the Bishop refers to the Scriptures, it may be well to follow the principal steps of his argument. It rests on three passages.

The first is that, in which St. Paul recites to the Corinthians the Instituting words of Christ as specially revealed to himself ; among which occurs the expression : " This do as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. 11 : 25. From this the Bishop argues, that it was Christ's " meaning and pleasure that they should often do it, so often as they met together to perform their public devotions to Him, if it was possible ; or, at least, every Lord's Day." (Tr. for Times, vol 1, p. 176.) As if Christ had said : " This do, as ye are often to drink it, in remembrance of me." It is needless to say that this is not the force of the language used. Our Saviour's words bear no more than this : " ὅσκις," as often as, or whenever, ye drink this cup, do so in Remembrance of me." Whether this should be once a day, or once a week, or once

a month, is a ^uquestion, which the passage leaves wholly untouched ; unless, indeed, as the word, "Drink," in the Greek, is not followed by the pronoun, "It," we take this passage thus : "This do, as often as ye drink, in remembrance of me ;" then, indeed, we should have the Communion with sufficient frequency ; that is, as often as the Christian slaked his thirst ; and what is more, we should have every man his own administrator of the mystery !

The next passage occurs in the account given of the conversion of the three thousand, of whom it is said : "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers ;" and, "continuing daily in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart. Acts, 2 : 42, 46. From this the Bishop argues ; "as they continued daily in the Temple, at the hours of prayer, to perform their solemn devotions there ; so they daily received the Holy Sacrament, and ate this Spiritual food," τροφήσ, "with gladness and singleness of heart ;" this being, indeed, the chief part of their devotions whenever they could meet together to perform them." (Tr. for Times, vol. 1, N. Y. p. 175.) But here, the premises are evidently too narrow for the conclusion. It must be remembered that the

Jews, who hated, and had just crucified the MASTER, were still occupants of their own Temple, and kept up there the daily service of their own worship. It is, therefore, absurd to suppose that they would allow the persecuted DISCIPLES to come there, and, at the very hour of that worship, daily celebrate that odious Sacrament of the death of Christ, side by side with their own religious rites! Besides, the passage does not say, nor imply, that the disciples broke break DAILY. It says, indeed, that they went daily to the Temple; but this means no more than that, though the Jewish Dispensation was Ecclesiastically at an end, yet, as the Temple worship was still outwardly maintained, so the disciples, being themselves Jews, still continued, as their Master had done, to frequent that worship for the simple purpose of joining in its ancient, and, as yet, undisplaced forms. As to the Lord's Supper, the passage says, "they continued steadfastly in the breaking of bread;" but steadfastness implies no particular degree of frequency; they might have been steadfast in the custom, though it had been but of monthly occurrence. Moreover; what is said of "breaking bread from house to house," and of "eating their meat," τροφή, "with gladness and singleness of heart," carries no reference either to the frequency of the Sacrament, or to the Sacrament itself. It refers, doubtless, to the

ordinary meals of the first Christians. To make "eating their meat" refer to the Sacrament is to introduce a new and strange kind of Transubstantiation. It is to change the elements, not into the Body and Blood of Christ, but, into men's ordinary food; for the word, rendered "meat," means, literally, the common and nutritious aliment of our bodies; and when used metaphorically, it is a metaphor, not of the Sacraments, but, of the DOCTRINES of the Gospel. Heb. 5 : 12, 14. The whole force of the language is evidently this : that, as the first Christians were led, by the stress of circumstances, to "have all things common," to sell "their possessions and goods, and part them to all as every man had need," so they socially and generously took their food, sometimes at one house and sometimes at another; sharing their common bounties, not with the dissocial, thankless, selfish spirit of those who hoard for themselves and grudge what they have hoarded, but, with the joyful and single hearts of men, who "live, not unto themselves, but, unto the Lord."

The last passage, on which the Bishop relies, is this : "Upon the first Day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, (ready to depart on the morrow,) and continued his speech until midnight." Acts, 20 : 7. From this he argues thus : "It is

true, St. Paul being to go away the next day, he took that opportunity, when they met together for that end," (the breaking of bread,) "to give them a sermon. But that was not the end of their meeting together at that time. They did not come to hear a sermon, though St. Paul himself was to preach; but they came together to administer and receive Christ's mystical body and blood; which plainly shows that this was the great work they did every Lord's Day." (Tr. for Times; N. Y. vol. I. p. 175.) But this also is too long a leap from premises to conclusion. The fact, that they came together on that particular Lord's Day "to break bread," no more proves that they did so "every Lord's Day," than the fact that some of our congregations have a communion once a month proves that they have it once a week. It rather shows that, as that particular Sunday was mentioned as Communion Day, there were other Sundays, on which there was no Communion. Had the writer said: "Upon the first Day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break bread, as they were wont to do every Lord's Day," the proof had been perfect. But, as he adds no such interpreting clause, he leaves the question of frequency to the Sacrament still untouched. Gravely to argue, therefore, from such premises, that the giving and receiving of the Lord's Supper was the great busi-

ness of every Lord's Day ; and to imply that preaching was but a sort of incident by the way, the occasional parting address of a journeying Apostle, is not only to disregard the main current of Scriptural testimony, but to strain a particular passage for proof, till it breaks and leaves the premises at an unapproachable distance from the conclusion.

Let it not be supposed, however, that by these remarks I am opposing frequent Communion. Possibly, in the Apostle's times, they were both more frequent and more simple than they are in our days, and in our Church. Possibly, they occurred every Lord's Day ; certainly, they were very simple ceremonies. They were called, not in the imposing phrase of later periods, "the Holy Sacraments," "the tremendous mystery of the Altar," but, in the language of men, who had learned of a sublimely simple Teacher, "the breaking of bread." They doubtless approached vastly nearer in simplicity, than they did in frequency, to an ordinary meal. And this may perhaps account for the gross abuse into which the still sensual Corinthians so early carried the Christian Feast, by turning it into an occasion of carnal and profane excess. In the undiscerning state of their minds, they slid easily from so simple a ceremonial into the excess of common eating and drinking. What

I have been endeavoring to show, however, is this : that it is impossible to decide, either from the language of Scripture, or from Apostolic practice, how frequent their seasons of Communion were ; whether daily, weekly, semi-monthly, or monthly ; or whether there were any statedly recurring periods for the administration of this Christian ordinance. I now add : that, however frequent their seasons of communion may have been, this would not, in the least, detract from the proofs which have been given that the preaching of the Gospel was the main labor of the Apostles' ministry, and the great instrument in the hand of the Spirit, for quickening the dead in trespasses and sins, and purifying them unto Love unfeigned.

2. But it is time to trace this comparison into the history of a later period.

What, then, was the condition of the Church during the Middle Ages, that long period when she made most of the Sacraments, and least of preaching ? It was a condition of deep, and almost universal Spiritual Death ! The two simple Sacraments instituted by her Divine Head had become highly artificial and deeply corrupted ; and to these had been added five others, fashioned out of most abused and perverted things ; and this whole cluster of multiplied and corrupted ceremonies had come to be regarded with most superstitious awe,

as though by a miraculous charm, they imparted saving grace, new life and holiness, to all, who, not being in mortal sin, received them. Meanwhile, the Scriptures were locked up in dead languages, and almost unknown to the people, and even to the lower orders of the clergy. Oral Tradition was virtually their law ; and the executor of that law was, the Spiritual despotism of the Hierarchy. The Ritual of the Church grew excessively cumbrous, and religion was supposed to consist so wholly in a strict observance of its forms, and to have so little to do with the virtues of private character, that it became an easy thing to acquire the reputation of being remarkably religious, while, to the knowledge of all, a man was scandalously immoral. It is impossible, in a few words, to picture the whole extent and aggravation of that Spiritual Death, which then reigned over the nominal heritage of Christ, and which had seized so deeply on both clergy and people.

I inquire not, now, whether the disuse of preaching led to this multiplication and abuse of the Sacraments ; or whether this multiplication and abuse of the Sacraments led to the disuse of preaching ; or whether some other causes had come in to corrupt the Church and to produce both the one and the other of those results. It is enough to know the simple fact, that, when Sacraments

were most numerous, and most frequent ; regarded with most awe and trusted with most confidence ; then there were least preaching, and most ignorance, darkest superstition, and deepest corruption. From whatever cause, the Scriptures and the preaching of the Cross were removed from their place ; and, being removed, there was no instrument, in the use of which the Spirit of Christ and the Father could restore to its pristine glory the fallen and decayed Body of the Redeemer.

4. This view is confirmed by following History one step further. At the Reformation, when a large portion of the Church was awakened from the sleep of ages, the work, man-wards, had its very beginning in the secret study of the Holy Scriptures by Wickliffe, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and the Monk of Erfurt ; and in the public preaching of the Gospel thus again brought to the knowledge and experience of its ministers. In the progress of the work, the Holy Scriptures were unlocked from the dead languages of antiquity and given to the public in their living mother tongues ; and the Ministers of the Word “blew the trumpet” long and loud in the ears of the sleepers, awakening multitudes to life, and nerving millions to action in defense of the Gospel. The new “Soldiers of Jesus Christ” brought from their sacred armory the long unused and rusted, but still heaven-tem-

pered weapons of Truth ; burnished them anew, trained themselves to their use, and skillfully wielded them in the work for which they were designed. Then again, "it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believed." Then again, "the preaching of the Cross" was made "the power of God." Then again, "the foolishness of God" was seen to be "wiser than men," and the "weakness of God" to be "stronger than men."

Of the facts now noticed, that during the Middle Ages, Preaching had been an almost unused instrumentality ; and that, at the Reformation it came again into eager requisition, there is no lack of illustration. Perhaps one as strong as can be given, all the stronger for present use from being of Protestant origin, is found in this ; that even Elizabeth, as patron Queen of the English Reformation, still retained so much of the prejudices of earlier times, that she openly set herself against what were then called "prophesyings;" i. e. meetings of the clergy for preaching several days together. Against Archbishop Grindal, the father and favorer of those meetings, she was deeply incensed, and intimated to him, personally, her royal pleasure that "the number of preachers should be abridged," and "all learned conferences among the ministers of the Church utterly subverted." In

his written reply,* the bold Bishop declared, against the face of Majesty, that her "speeches had exceedingly dismayed and discomforted him." Like a true man of God, in nothing daunted by the voice of power, he stood up for his Master, and fearlessly said to the, in this matter, misguided Queen, "God forbid, Madam, that you should open your ears to any of their wicked persuasions, or in any way diminish the preaching of the Gospel." "Where it is thought that the reading of godly Homilies, set forth by public authority, may suffice; the reading of homilies hath his commodities; but it is nothing comparable to the office of preaching. The godly preacher is learned in the Gospel, who can apply his speech to the diversity of times, places, and hearers; which can not be done in Homilies." "I am enforced, with all humility, yet plainly, to profess that I cannot, with safe conscience, and without the offense of the majesty of God, give mine assent to the suppressing of the said exercises; much less, can I send out any injunction for the utter and universal subversion of the same. I say with St. Paul: 'I have no power to destroy, but only to edify;' and with the same Apostle: 'I can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'" 2 Cor. 10: 8; 13: 8.

* Grindal's letter to the Queen; Fuller's Hist. of Ch. Lond. 1837, p. 7-18.

How exactly is this conceived in the spirit of the Apostles at Jerusalem, who, when "straightly threatened to speak henceforth to no man in the name" of Christ, replied : " Whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye ; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard ;" Acts, 4 : 19, 20 ; and who, when further questioned for their fidelity, responded in the calm heroism of those memorable words : " We ought to obey God rather than men ;" Acts, 5 : 29 ; and then proceeded, in the very face of their persecutors, to preach that sacred name, which Jewish prejudice would fain have buried in enduring oblivion ! The Queen of England did not wish to put the name of Jesus under a ban ; but she had been so little accustomed to a fearless, stirring and frequent preaching of His Gospel, that she disliked this feature of the Reformation ; and for this dislike her brave Archbishop reproved her with a manly and God-fearing honesty, worthy of the first days of Christianity and of the best martyrs for Christ. She might send him to the Tower, or take from him his office ; but she could not make him suppress prophecy-ings.

This comparative view might be followed much farther, and made much fuller, but the limits of this part of the discussion have been reached ;

besides, enough has been said to show that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ is, and ever should have been, the great work of all his ministers ; and that it is not without reason that their high commission sends them, first, to "do the work of Evangelists ;" and second, to administer the Sacraments of Christ. Enough has been said to give peculiar point to the language of our Eastern Bishop Griswold : "The Apostles would 'give themselves continually to prayer, and the ministry of the Word.' " How different the conduct of those dignitaries of the Church in some parts of the world, who, when they have reached the Apostleship, and when they ought to be 'servants of all,' instead of giving themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word, neglect both, employing chaplains to pray for them, and settling curates to preach : Well might Jewel say : "A Bishop should die preaching."*

* The following extract from Hooker, (*Eccl. Pol.*, B. v., § 22,) who had Jewel for his patron and Grindal for his contemporary, shows in what esteem preaching was held not only by that great writer, but also by multitudes besides, whom the Reformation had awakened from those long slumbers, during which the pulpit had been so nearly silent. It shows that preaching had risen, with some, into such inordinate repute as even to require a caution lest it should bring into disuse the public reading of the Scriptures in the Churches.

"So worthy a part of Divine Service we should greatly wrong, if we did not esteem preaching as the blessed ordinance of God, sermons, as keys to the kingdom of heaven, as wings to the soul, as spurs to the good affections

From what has been thus far said, it is not to be inferred that the efficacy of preaching lies peculiarly in human power ; or that man is to be extolled for success in this work. The whole efficacy of ordinances, whether in preaching or in Sacraments, resides, as we have already seen, in the accompanying grace of the Holy Ghost, sealing upon the mind, the meaning and the power of Divine Truth. To make the Sacraments the main channels of grace, is as much to exalt human power, as to make preaching the main channel. The truth is, human power is nothing in either. In the ministry of the Gospel, the man is put out of view behind

of men, unto the sound and healthy, as food, as physic unto diseased minds. Wherefore, how highly soever it may please them with words to extol sermons, they shall not herein offend us. We seek, not to derogate from any thing, which they can justly esteem ; but our desire is to uphold the just estimation of that, from which, it seemeth unto us, they derogate more than becometh them. That which offendeth us is, first, the great disgrace which they offer unto our custom of bare reading of the Word of God ; and to His gracious Spirit ; the principal virtue whereof, thereby manifesting itself for the endless good of men's souls, even the virtue, which it hath to convert, to edify, to save souls ; this they mightily strive to obscure ; and secondly, the shifts wherewith they maintain their opinion of sermons, whereunto while they labor to appropriate, (i. e. to confine,) the saving power of the Holy Ghost, they separate from apparent hope of life and salvation, thousands, whom the goodness of Almighty God doth not exclude."

That preaching rose into such repute was proof of its peculiar power. That it was carried, by separatists from the Established Church, to the length of excluding from their public services "the bare reading of the Word," may be considered as a temporary, almost inevitable, recoil of the ordinance from a state of extreme depression, to one of extreme exaltation.

the commission which he bears, and the Truth which he holds forth. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord ; and ourselves, your servants, for Jesus' Sake." 2 Cor. 4 : 5. "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath," indeed, "shined in the hearts" of all his true ministers "to give the light of knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ ;" 2 Cor. 4 : 6 ; and hath thus qualified them for the great work of preaching His Gospel ; teaching them to "renounce the hidden things of dishonesty ; not walking in craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully ; but by manifestation of the Truth, commending themselves unto every man's conscience in the sight of God." 2 Cor. 4 : 2. Christ's ministers are no more than earthen vessels, which derive their whole importance from the preciousness of the treasure, which they contain ; and this treasure has been put into such frail receivers for the avowed purpose of making it the more manifest, that the whole excellency of the power, felt in the preaching of the Gospel, is of God, and not of us. The illustration of this point by an English preacher, on occasion of ordaining a young brother to the ministry, was beautiful. "Your work," said he, (I cite from memory only) "will be to preach, not yourself, but, Jesus Christ ; and, in presenting Him to your people, you must be

like a man holding up to view a picture, so large as wholly to conceal himself. Let Christ alone appear in all your ministrations. In holding Him forth before you, be careful that you let not your people see so much as your little finger." Precisely in this spirit are the words of the Apostle: "Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers,"—servants—"by whom ye have believed even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted; Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God, that giveth the increase." 1 Cor. 3: 5, 7.

Nor, again, from what has been said may it be inferred that they, who hold this view of preaching, do in any way make light of the Sacraments, or consider them of small value or efficacy. To detract from the true solemnity and preciousness of the Sacraments betrays either a sad ignorance of their nature and objects, or a wicked hostility to the interests of Christ's religion. The true ground of regret is, not that the Sacraments have been highly esteemed, but that they have been wrongly understood and therefore wrongly used. The value of a faithful preaching of the Gospel may be extolled, not too highly, but too exclusively. Men may err on this side as well as on the other; and in this error the Church has

had, if not an equally protracted and disastrous, yet a truly sad and sore experience. When ministers rely too exclusively on preaching for the fruit of their labors, we have seen a strong tendency to the multiplication of human artifices and management for the purpose of giving to their ministry instant and enlarged effect ; and, perhaps, an equally strong tendency to the puffing up of the pride and vanity of the human heart amid the apparent evidences of ministerial success ; with a proneness among hearers to run after popular men and popular measures, rather than to seek for the power of Christ, the Spirit of God, and the simplicity of Truth in the appointed services of His Church. As in relying on the Sacraments, to the neglect of preaching, there is a tendency to multiply, corrupt and abuse those Sacraments by human additions and conceits ; so, in relying on preaching to the neglect of the Sacraments, there is an opposite tendency to multiply, vary and misdirect human artifices and popular measures with the view of giving that preaching greater effect. There is, however, a very significant difference between the two tendencies ; the former breeds an abuse, which man's native superstitiousness and self-righteousness render self-perpetuating ; the latter works an evil, which, by its own violence, may almost be called self-remedying. The

one ends in a chronic, and all but incurable disease ; the other terminates in a spasm, which cannot well last long. Nevertheless, on either hand, experience has taught the Church an expensive but valuable lesson ; and in the light thus offered, the true question in the argument before us, is, not which shall be excluded, preaching or the Sacraments, but what are the true place and importance of each? An answer to this question is all we need in bringing this part of the subject to a conclusion.

II. What, then, are the true place and importance, relatively to each other, of Preaching and the Sacraments?

1. First, of Preaching.

(1.) The citations, which have been made, from the Christian Scriptures make it sufficiently plain that this Divine Ordinance finds its principal place and importance in its character as the great Instrument in the hand of the Spirit for the conversion of men from sin to holiness ; for instructing, convincing, awakening and quickening them unto a new life ; for bringing them to true repentance and living faith, to fervent love, and holy obedience ; for leading them intelligently and unreservedly to Christ as the only Saviour ; and thus for bringing them to the entrance and through the gate, which opens into the way of Life Eternal.

To this its high office the ordinance is fitted on the principle already stated, that Truth is the utterance, the breath, of the Spirit. It is the very converse of the Spirit of God with the mind of man. God, as it were, puts Himself forth in the form of Truth ; and thus, to the measure of the mind's capacities, makes Himself understood, comprehended, and felt. Now, preaching deals openly with Truth, and is Christ's great ordinance for dealing with it most effectually. The chief office of the ministry lies in "rightly dividing the Word of Truth;" it is thus that the Servant of Christ "shows himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," 2 Tim. 2 : 15, "an able minister of the New Testament, not of the letter," merely, "but of the Spirit," 2 Cor. 3 : 6, "a scribe well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, and bringing forth out of his treasures things new and old." Matt. 13 : 52. Divine Truth, in some form, appears to be both the Instrument, with which the Spirit quickens the soul ; and the light, through which the soul sees God and all eternal things ; and he who best knows how to divide this truth, to separate it unto its several offices, and to point the arrows of its power with the greatest wisdom and skill, is the ablest minister of the New Testament, and the best instructed scribe in the things of the kingdom. He will be the means

of convincing most men of sin, and bringing most to the Saviour.

That such is the momentous office of preaching, there can, I think, be no doubt in the mind of one who, with unprejudiced care, studies "the Living Oracles" on this point. From these Oracles, especially, as confirmed by the ways of God, comes a voice to this effect, loud, clear, and not to be misunderstood.

(2.) But, though the primary, yet this is not the only office of preaching. It is, still further, one of the principal means of "building up" Christians in "their most holy faith," after they have been brought to Christ, within the entrance of the way of Life.

Such Christians are taught of Christ to look to God's Word of Truth for Sanctification. "Sanctify them through thy Truth ; thy word is Truth." Jno. 17 : 17. They are enjoined by an Apostle, "as new-born babes to desire the sincere milk of the Word that they may grow thereby ;" 1 Peter, 2 : 2, to "let the Word of Christ dwell in them richly ;" Col. 3 : 16 ; to be "swift to hear ;" and to "receive with meekness that ingrafted Word, which is able to save their souls." James 1 : 19, 21. In reference to the different strength of the doctrines preached, as adapted to the different progress of Christians in their new life, the Apostle fed some

“with milk,” and others “with strong meat,” 1 Cor. 3 : 1-3, the former as being “yet carnal ;” the latter as having become “Spiritual ;” the one as retaining still something of low and gross views of the Gospel, and of Christian character ; the other, as having reached a higher degree of knowledge, purity and perfectness in the heavenly life ; the one, as being disposed to “envy, strife, and divisions ;” the other, as seeing more deeply into the generousness, love, and union, which should pervade the living “Body of Christ.” All these results, too, came through the various degrees of thoroughness, with which those early Christians had received “the things, which were freely given them of God ; and which things also” the Apostle “spake . . . not in the words, which man’s wisdom teacheth, but, which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” 1 Cor. 2 : 12, 13. To the Hebrew Christians, some of whom had probably been scribes and doctors in their law, and who had been under Christian instruction long enough to have become preachers of the Gospel, and yet were still “dull of hearing,” the Apostle writes thus : “For when, for the time, ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that

useth milk is unskillful in the word of Righteousness ; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth unto them, that are of full age ; to those, who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Heb. 5 : 12-14. What divine skill does all this evidence in so "dividing the Word of Truth" as to build up true Christians from one degree of perfectness to another in the new life ; from the babe, to the man of full age ; from the carnal, to the spiritual ; from the dull of hearing, to those, who, by reason of use, have their inner senses exercised to discern both good and evil ! And how remarkable, that in all this work of "building up" Christians, "in their most holy faith," the Word, THE WORD is the only instrument mentioned, as wielded by the Spirit in the hand of a living ministry ! See also, 2 Tim. 3 : 16, 17.

(3.) The ordinance of preaching has one further office still. It is to banish error from the Church, and to preserve the purity of her heaven-taught doctrines.

Hence the preachers of the Gospel were required to "hold fast the faithful Word as they had been taught, that they might be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." Tit. 1 : 9. And though it be not exclusively, yet it is eminently, the work of a preach-

ing ministry, to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," seeing that there are ever those who "creep in unawares, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Jude, 3 : 4. To this work of banishing error from the Church, her ministers are now ordained, as an important part of their sacred office ; and it is a work, which they may and should do in various ways. They ought to preach against error from the Pulpit and from the Press ; at one time, in "doctrine" which shall "drop as the rain," and in "speech," "which shall distill as the dew ;" Deut. 32 : 2 ; and at another in that strenuous argumentation, which shall mightily confound falsehood, and in that vigorous and keen, yet calm and dignified controversy, which shall effectually sift sophistry and expose the lurking-places of error ; now, in the uttered homily, "by which they may most quickeningly commend themselves to every man's conscience in the Sight of God ;" and again in the imprinted volume, from which, "though dead," the man of Christ may "yet speak" and preach the Gospel of His Saving Truth to generations long to come ; that they, too, the yet unborn, may "walk in truth," and not be led away of falsehood.

In a word ; to sum up this whole topic, it is by the preaching of the Gospel in all practicable ways,

that Christ, by the Spirit, seeks to illumine the darkened mind, and to new-create the sinful heart, of the "natural man"; to lay the foundations of holy character deep, and strong, and broad, in the understanding and in the affections; to build up and garnish with heavenly graces the structure of individual holiness, for which these foundations are laid; to "chase away erroneous and strange doctrines" from the Church of God; to keep Truth victorious, and to multiply the deep and permanent conquests of Christ's spiritual kingdom. The preaching of the Cross may be considered the "greater Light," which Christ hath hung in the firmament of the Church, and according as that Light shines brightly or dimly, from a cloudless or a clouded sky, this Church will walk as in the day, or stumble as in the darkness.

2. Second, then, as to the Sacraments. What, in this comparison, are their true place and importance?

(1.) As to Baptism; its effect on the mind of Infancy, is, we apprehend, not immediate, but prospective. Baptism brings Infants into the visible Church, and into external covenant with God. It seals or certifies to them the truth of those divine promises, which are to the people of God, "and their children." Acts, 2 : 39. It gives them, thus, a right to all the outward privileges of their rela-

tion. It surrounds them with the breath of prayer, and with the thoughtful solitudes of believing and watchful Christians. It puts them to school where Christ is master, and the Spirit, monitor ; the Bible, text-book ; and Worship, exercise ; Christians, companions ; and their way, Charity ; that thus their earliest opening faculties and first dawning reason may be educated for Heaven, and, if possible, get light and power from God before they contract more than original darkness and corruption from the World. Upon all this, too, it brings God's covenanted blessing, in order to throw a brighter hope and gather a more cheering encouragement into the prospects for eternity of the seed of God's people. But, in all this, great and unspeakable as is the benefit, the effect of Baptism on the soul is necessarily prospective ; and such are the perils of this world, even to the children of Christians, that the whole priceless good may be lost !

But, on the minds of adults, coming to Baptism with the Scriptural requisites of true repentance and a living faith, its effect may be considered immediate. Yet this effect comes not as from a sacred charm, or from the Spirit indwelling with the water and making that water life-giving ; but rather, to use the language of our 27th Article, to such " faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by

virtue of prayer to God." Having faith and grace as prerequisites, that faith is confirmed and that grace increased, not by any mystery in the water, but, by God's hearing of prayer. Coming with souls new-born, and with hearts longing for fuller blessings, they feel that it is good thus publicly to seal themselves Christ's, and thus openly to take the plighted shield of God to keep them in their future conflict with the world. Putting, therefore, their own hearts into the ascending prayer of the Church, they realize the descending grace of the Spirit, and go forth, from the impressive covenanting stronger in faith, more resolved in purpose, and more enlivened in Spirit, as if heavenly dews had fallen, and refreshed their whole nature.

(2.) And as to the Lord's Supper, this, in its effects on the Soul of the true Christian, with the Holy Spirit filling all and energizing all, is doubtless, an eminent means of Grace. It is true that neither the Bible nor our Church teaches men to bring their post-baptismal sins to this Sacrament for remission. On the contrary, both teach them to come with clean hands, and pure hearts, and sins forgiven, through faith in Christ; that thus prepared for the Table of their Lord, they may receive the blessings that await them there. And these blessings are, growth in true love, union, and purity, and all perfectness of Christian character.

When the Church is kept pure by a faithful preaching of the full and incorrupt Gospel of Christ crucified, and when her ministrations are blessed by the power of the overshadowing and life-giving Spirit, the Lord's Supper is an ordinance, in which the believer comes into closest communion with his Saviour, and feels his love for Jesus kindling into its intensest glow ; in which, moreover, he comes into holiest communion with his fellow-Christians of all ages and nations, and feels himself most inseparably knit to them in "the Communion of Saints," in the Union of the great, mystical Body of Christ ; and in which he realizes a peculiar "strengthening and refreshing of his soul" in all her divine and heavenly graces of faith and courage, humility and purity, deadness to the world, and ripeness for heaven. Through the Divinely ordained symbol of the Sacrifice on the Cross, Faith feeds on "all the benefits of His Passion," enters into all the depths of that Union, which subsists between each member of the Body and its Head, and draws a happy immortality from the Fountain of all Life !

In the view, thus taken, of the relative place and importance of the Divine Ordinances of Preaching and the Sacraments, neither interferes with the other ; but both concur in helping sinful man from the world into Christ, and through Christ into

Heaven. Together. these ordinances form a system of means, divinely conceived and divinely fitted to the great end of bringing, into individual experience, the salvation purchased for men by the Sacrifice of the Cross. As embodied into this system, their relation stands thus :—

The preaching of the Gospel is ordained to bring men intelligently and in their own personal experience, to Christ by repentance and faith, with holy love, and an obedient surrender of themselves to His service. Baptism is appointed to introduce them into the visible Church, in infancy, if they are the children of professedly believing parents, and, in riper years, if they have been converted from among the unbelieving ; and, in both cases, to be a seal unto them of the promises of God, a sign of their spiritual new birth, a badge of their Christian soldier-ship, and a means, in conjunction with the prayer of faith and the ministry of the Word, of realizing to them all the benefits of Christ's Death and Passion. And then, for the nourishment, growth, and perfecting of their new Christian life, the preaching of the Word, and the Lord's Supper are ordained jointly to take up the office of means, and to go hand in hand in the common work of edifying the character of those, who are truly regenerate, of guarding and perfecting the purity of the Church, and of ripening the whole Christian fellowship for

the glories of the eternal Communion of Saints in the immediate presence of God.

And now, with an obvious reflection or two, we dismiss the subject of this Introductory essay.

While we seek, then, by the light of the Bible, to discern and assign the true relations of these Christian Ordinances to their great and common end, we should carefully regard them all as originating in the same Divine Authority ; and therefore, on one common ground, entitled to our affectionate and obedient regard. Let preaching and the Sacraments, then, be duly revered. Let neither be put down for the sake of exalting the other into solitary eminence, and single consideration. Either extreme is full of danger. Dark superstition, with its misty imaginings and its debasing corruptions, lies at the one ; and at the other, that cold contempt, which human reason, vanity, and pride, cast on all outward, though Divine, symbols of our "most holy faith." It is at the mean, between these extremes, that all things are united in their due proportion and harmony. At this mean, life enters into all ordinances ; while the light of reason and the superior light of Revelation blend in showing the beauty of the whole body of Christ's Institutions, and in commending the whole to the approval of our understandings, to the love of our hearts, and to the reverence of our faith.

It will not be useless to suggest once more, that everything, which has been said about the written Word of God, as that Body of Eternal Truth, which has been given to us ; about the preaching of that Word, as the great work of the ministry ; and about the Sacraments of Christ, as the hallowed symbols of His religion, has had reference to something higher, more vital, and more divine than any, or than all, of these things ; to the necessary power and teachings of the Holy Spirit, that Divine Agent, which, using Truth as His single Instrument, seeks, thereby, the quickening, purifying, and perfecting of all the children of God ; and which, if He use the preaching of the Gospel as His right hand, in wielding "the Sword of the Word" for the slaying of sin and error, and for conquering the enmity of the world, does also use the Sacraments as His left hand in holding over the Church a broad and consecrated Shield of protection, and in putting to the lips of our souls a full and refreshing cup of strength and consolation. It is, at our worst peril, that we, either theoretically or practically, lose sight of this Sacred Agent, the Spirit of the Father and the Son, amid that branching, yet united, system of channels, through which he makes His ordinary approaches to our understandings and our hearts ; seeking, thus, to reach our invisible souls through our bodily senses,

and through those audible and visible means of Preaching and the Sacraments, in which those senses are met. To lose sight of this Spirit, and to think only, or mainly of the Truth, its ministry and its symbols, is as unreasonable as it would be to forget that the body carries a soul, and as dangerous as it would be to pay to a graven image, the honor due unto God. Let the Divine Spirit, the Sacred Illuminator and Comforter of the Soul, be ever held in clear view amid the surrounding Institutes of the Church, and always regarded as the only efficient Agent in our New-birth and Sanctification ; acting alone through all sensible channels, and using Truth, men, and ordinances, in doing His own proper work ; we shall, then, be in least danger either of misplacing, or of disproportionately valuing outward things ; and most sure of finding the whole Body of the Church filled with Christ and with His life-giving power to the salvation of our souls.

PART I.



OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

ERRONEOUS VIEWS STATED AND EXAMINED.

THE ensuing Treatise assumes the truth of the following positions: that, in His dispensation of grace, the design of God is—to save men from sin; that, to this salvation, the renewal and sanctification of the soul are indispensably necessary; that this renewal and sanctification are wrought by the Holy Spirit; that the instrument, which He uses in this work, is Divine truth, written or otherwise communicated; and that the appointed channels, through which He ordinarily brings this truth into action on the mind, are, since the Age of Inspiration has passed, preaching and the Sacraments. Those, who desire to see these positions illustrated and confirmed, are requested to read with attention the Chapters, which, by way of Introduction, are prefixed to the Treatise.

In what the preaching of the Gospel consists, it is not necessary now to inquire. The discussions, which our Age has revived in the Church, though decidedly depreciating the ordinance of preaching,

yet turn chiefly on the *Sacraments* ; which, in these discussions, are characterized, not merely as the channels, but as "*The sources of Divine grace.*" Into this part of the subject, therefore, it is more important to inquire ; and upon this inquiry I propose now to enter. What is the nature of the Christian Sacraments ; and what their design and efficacy ? This is the subject before us. It is deeply important. Let us approach it with candor and with reverence.

The Sacraments of Christ—and, it is needless to say, we admit no other—are—BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER. Baptism, like the Laver in the ancient Temple, stands at the entrance of the Church, the symbol of our needed purification from sin, and of that Divine Spirit by whose washing we are cleansed. The Lord's Supper, like the mercy-seat, occupies the inner recess, the symbol of Atonement, and of that Christ, by whose great Sacrifice the atoning work was done. Baptism is administered, to infants, in sign of the purifying, which they need ; to adults, in sign of the purification, which they profess to have received ; and to both, as that by which they are received into the Church, the mystic Body of Christ, that they may be nurtured there into all the growth and strength of perfect members. And the Lord's Sup-

per is administered to those only, who, having been baptized, give, or are required to give, evidence that they *are* what their baptism *represents*, the truly penitent and believing disciples, the renewed and obedient followers, of the Lord Jesus.

I. I inquire, first, into the nature of BAPTISM : not its material and sensible part, but its religious nature and design. What did Christ intend, and what do the baptized realize, in this ordinance ?

Before answering this question directly, I propose to examine, at considerable length, the theory of those, who have revived the present discussion, in England and in this country. This Theory may be gathered from the following specimens of the language, in which their views are expressed.

“Baptism containeth the remission of sins,” and “hath the germ of Spiritual life.”* It is “that mystery, whereby we are made partakers of the Incarnation,”—“baptized into the ‘One Body’—the body of our incarnate Lord.”† “This exposition”—that, which makes John 1 : 12, 13, refer to baptism as the instrument of the birth there mentioned—“is founded on the very notion, that the partaking of the Incarnation and the Chris-

* Dr. Pusey's Sermon before the University of Oxford, N. Y. Ed. p. 5. The following references are all to the N. Y. Edition of the Sermon, and of the Tracts for the Times, vol. II. part 1.

† Tracts, Vol. II. p. 44.

tian relation of sonship to God is imparted through baptism, and is not imparted without it.”* “The pardon of sins is the direct provision in baptism.” “Baptism gives life.”† “Herein are we justified, or both accounted and made righteous;”—“have a new principle of life imparted to us; since, having been made members of Christ, we have a portion of His life, or of Him who is our life.”‡ “In baptism, two very different causes are combined: the one, God Himself; the other, a creature which He hath thought fit to hallow to this end.”§ “Water, sanctified by our Lord’s baptism, is the womb of our new birth.”|| In baptism, “the old man is laid aside, the new taken; he entereth a sinner, he ariseth justified.”¶ “Regeneration is the ‘being born again of water and the Spirit,’ or, by God’s Spirit moving again on the face of the Waters, sanctifying them for our cleansing, and cleansing us thereby.”** Baptism is called, “This Miracle;”†† and, by way of indicating the reality of this miracle, the baptized used to be called “Christophori, Theophori;” Christ-bearers, God-bearers.‡‡ “That Oneness with Him in His Son,”—alleged to be wrought through the Sacraments,—is

* Vol. II. p. 31.

† Sermon, p. 6.

‡ Vol. II. p. 24.

§ Vol. II. p. 26.

|| Vol. II. p. 43.

¶ Vol. II. pp. 47.

** Vol. II. pp. 47, 48.

†† Vol. II. p. 68.

‡‡ Vol. II. p. 44.

called, "the perfection of Eternal bliss, where will, thought, affections shall be one, because we shall be, by communication of His Divine nature, one."* "The view, then, here held of Baptism, is, that we be ingrafted into Christ, and thereby receive a principle of life, afterwards to be developed and enlarged by fuller influxes of His grace ; so that neither is baptism looked upon as an infusion of grace distinct from the incorporation into Christ ; nor is that incorporation conceived of as separate from its attendant blessings."† "No change of heart, or of the affections, no repentance however radical, no faith, no life, no love can come up to the idea of this 'birth from above' ; it takes them all in, and comprehends them all, but itself is more than all ; it is not only the creation of a new heart, new affections, new desires, and, *as it were*, a new birth, but is an *actual* birth from above, or from God, a gift coming down from God and given to faith through baptism ; yet, not the work *of* faith, but the operation *of* 'Water and the Holy Spirit' ; the Holy Spirit giving us a new life in the fountain opened by Him, and we being born therein *of* Him, even as our blessed and Incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb." "Our new birth" is "itself the gift of

* Serm. p. 8.

† Vol. II. pp. 24, 25.

God,"—"illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery from which it flows, the Incarnation of our Redeemer."*

I would not force these expressions into a meaning not intended ; yet it is desirable to throw them somewhat more into summary, that the Theory of Baptism, which they really teach, may be seen at a glance.

According to this Theory, then,—we take it as applied to Infants,—in Baptism, the Holy Spirit, moving on the face of the water and sanctifying it, is communicated to the unconscious Infant, and makes him a partaker in the Incarnation, as He at first overshadowed the Blessed Virgin and made the Son of God incarnate in our nature. Being "baptized into One Body," therefore, means,—not, as usually understood, grafted into the Church, as the One, mystical Body of Christ, but—"baptized into the Body of our Incarnate Lord," as explanatory of the phrase, "made partakers of the Incarnation." In consequence of this *literal* ingrafting into Christ, baptism gives life, the germ, the principle, of Spiritual life, "*a portion of Him, who is our Life.*" Thus efficacious, baptism is both justifying and sanctifying, both the accounting and the making of us righteous. In short, by

* Vol. II. p. 43.

“this miracle,” “this communication of the Divine nature,” the baptized “lays aside the old man, and takes the new ;” he enters the water sinful flesh ; he rises from it, as from an “overwhelming mystery,” Christophorus, Theophorus ! Such is the Theory : the Holy Spirit imparted to the Water ; in that water receiving the Infant and imparting to him Christ ; and then presenting him, as he leaves the font, justified in the twofold sense of being accounted and made righteous, the subject of a miraculous communication of the Divine nature, or of “a portion of Him” in whom that nature resides.

This is Baptismal Regeneration, as held by a master of the Doctrine, in distinction from the system, which, as he alleges, “the moderns have formed ;” and between which and “the exposition of the ancient Church,” he declares, “the difference is radical, essential.”* This is what he terms the “overwhelming mystery,”† and of this it is that he says, “It relates to no insulated point, no by, or incidental question, which may be laid aside or assumed without affecting the rest. It lies, as is confessed, at the root of the whole system, as some say, a deadening doctrine ; as the old Church found it, full of life : but, in either case, it is the point from which the two opposite systems, that divide the Church, diverge.”‡

* Tracts, Vol. II, p. 47.

† Vol. II, p. 44,

‡ Vol. II, p. 38.

I believe that all, acquainted with the subject, will admit, that the difference between the two systems *is* radical, and essential ; but, of these, many will feel constrained to say, that the theory, just stated, is unsustained by the sense of Scripture ; that its absurdity is as great as that of Transubstantiation itself ; and that, if “the old Church” grew vital by hugging this Theory to her bosom, she gathered from it nothing better than the vitality of her long-lived superstitions. The advocates of this theory warn us against asking : “How can these things be ?” They call all such “Nicodemus questions ;” they urge us to believe, that we may understand ; and they caution us against turning certain Scriptures into figures, lest we thereby justify heretics in turning all other vital truths into the emptiness of mere tropes. Nevertheless, as their theory makes at least an attempt to interpret the Scriptures, and enters rather boldly into their “exposition,” we must even attempt the same thing. We must not be deterred from the study of the Scriptures by any mistimed caution. Nor must we be content merely to look upon them with the eye and believe. We must seek to discover their real meaning ; and our object in this search should be—not to avoid finding figures in the Bible, but, where we do find them—to ascertain the true sense which they carry.

To proceed, then, in our approaches towards the subject, as it lies in the Bible—the Theory of Baptism, which I have presented, finds its corner-stone in this notion, that, in order to regeneration and Spiritual life, the baptized must be, not merely renewed and made holy by repentance, faith and obedience, but—as something deeper, and more miraculous than this—made “partakers of the Incarnation:” that the office of the Holy Spirit is—to work in the baptized, *by* the Water which it sanctifies and fills, a participation of Christ’s whole nature; “an illimitable, incomprehensible mystery,” analogous to that, in which the same Divine agent made Christ incarnate in the womb of the Virgin, when He brought the Divine nature into union with the human, and imparted to the latter the life of the former. The theory understands the phrases, “born of God,” “born of the Spirit,” as in the strictest sense literal; that, as infants are born not only *by*, but *of*, their parents, of their *substance*, so the baptized are born of God, of the Spirit, not only by His operation, but literally *of* Him by a communication of a portion of His Divine nature. The Idea, perhaps most frequently, takes this form; that the baptized participate in the Incarnation; that they are, “not by any *figure* or *likeness*, but *actually*, Sons of God, because He, in whom and *of* whom they are made, is, not by any

figure or likeness, but actually, the Son of God ;"—that they are "parts of the Second Adam as they were by nature of the first."*

But, both the Theory and its Corner-stone rest on something still lower down. The dogma seeks its ultimate support in something still further back ;—in a correlative notion of what, at first, constituted "*Original Righteousness*" and of what now constitutes "*Original Sin*." In order that the theory of Baptismal Regeneration might not look too like a new conceit, related to nothing in earlier Divine disclosures, its framers go back to the creation and fall of man, and impose on those great facts a character correspondent with their own view of the means of man's recovery from sin and of his restoration to his original privilege. Their view of these points is briefly this.

1. As to the *Creation* of man, Original Righteousness consisted—not in "actual inherent holiness," (the Image of God) but—in a "Supernatural clothing," "over and above nature ;"† and this, "agreeably with the view of Justification already

* Tracts. Vol. II, p. 44.

† "Christ *clothes* us with something *over and above nature*, which Adam forfeited." Newman on Justification. Lond. 1838, p. 180.

In Baptism, "We are first *clothed* upon by Him, and when we have been thus clothed, the blessing is pronounced upon "him that watcheth and keepeth his *garments*, lest he walk naked."—Dr. Pusey's "Treatise on Baptism." Tract 67, p. 91.

taken is nothing less than the inward presence either of the Divine Word, or of the Holy Ghost."* Consequently, Original Sin consists, not in the loss of "actual inherent holiness," or the Image of God, but in the deprivation, or forfeiture, of this "supernatural clothing," this mysterious endowment of Divinity. In other words, God at first created, not a mere perfect man, a man in the Divine Image, because of a rational and moral nature and perfect in his kind, but such a perfect man with a Divine addition to his perfection, a literal Theophorus, a created being with an endowment uncreated ;

* Newman on Justification, p. 180. See, also, the following passages from the same work, as showing how distinct is this alleged original, justifying Righteousness, which was lost at the Fall, and is regained in Baptism, from anything in man, or of man, as the result of God's working.

"Justifying Righteousness, . . . is not any mere quality of mind, whether of faith or holiness." Pp. 154, 155.

"Justification is not a mere change of state in us, or a liberty, privilege, or (as it may be called) citizenship; but a something lodged within us." P. 157.

"The Righteousness on which we are called righteous, though *within* us, . . . yet is not *of* us, nor *in* us, nor any quality or act of our minds, not faith, not renovation, not obedience, not anything cognizable by man, but a certain Divine gift in which all these qualifications are included." P. 159.

Explaining this "gift of Righteousness," the author says, "The Divine Presence vouchsafed to us, besides being that of the Holy Trinity, is specially said to be the presence of *Christ* ; which would seem to imply that "*the Word made flesh*" is, in some mysterious manner, bestowed upon us." P. 164.

The saints of the Old Dispensation differ from those of the New, in that the former were not, while the latter are, "partakers in the Body and blood of the Incarnate Son." P. 225.

and then, by the fall, man not only lost his "actual, inherent holiness," but also forfeited this "supernatural investment;" in which forfeiture, not in the loss of holiness, consists Original Sin.

Now, from this unscriptural notion, this apparent forethought, which is yet an afterthought, this seeming parent, which is yet an offspring, the theory of Baptismal Regeneration now in view appears naturally to follow. The added "supernatural investment," which, as alleged, was forfeited by the fall, is, by Baptism, miraculously restored; and thus the baptized becomes, as at first, more than man, "a partaker in the Incarnation," a literal "Theophorus," "not by any figure, or likeness, but actually, a Son of God," "a part of the second Adam."

It is evident, therefore, that, in examining this Theory, the first thing requisite is, to show the baselessness of the foregoing notion of Original Righteousness and Original Sin. To do this fully would require a volume; but for the present purpose much less will be sufficient.

What foundation, then, has this notion?—In the Bible, none at all. It is a pure figment. The Bible gives no account of the creation and endowment of such a being as this notion supposes. "Let us make man in our Image, after our likeness. . . . So God created man in His own Image." Gen. 1 : 26, 27. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the

ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Gen. 2:7. This is the whole of the simply sublime account, which the Bible gives of the creation of man; an event, in view of which God pronounced His whole created work, not only "good," as He had pronounced it before, but "very good," now that one in His own Image stood up to understand, admire and enjoy the magnificent whole. But where, in this account, do we find any trace of the notion, that man was not only created in the Image of God, but also gifted with an additional "supernatural investment,"—"the inward presence of the Divine Word, or of the Holy Ghost?" We find, indeed, that, as to his rational and moral part, he was not formed, but "created"; and that, as to his material and corruptible part, he was not created, but "formed;" or that the soul was brought into being by that mysterious energy, which spake existence out of non-existence; while the body was fashioned out of previously existing matter—"the dust of the ground:" a difference of origin possibly indicated by the two Hebrew words used, viz: *בָּרָא* and *עָשָׂה*. We find also, that, after man's lifeless body had been thus formed, God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" and that thus, the "created" and the "formed" taking union, "man became a living soul,"—a simply

perfect man, not only "good" but "very good," the best of his Creator's works, new from his Maker's hand and bright in his Maker's Image. But in all this we find no place for any additional "supernatural investment." The most obvious point, at which this can be supposed to have been given, is that closing act, in which God breathed, into the yet unbreathing nostrils, the literal, common breath of life. But, to suppose that, at the same moment and in the same act, He imparted the additional "supernatural investment," would be a gratuitous and baseless assumption. It is needless to say that, to suppose this added "mysterious gift" to have been made at any other point in the great creative process, would be an assumption equally groundless. The notion of such an addition to simply perfect humanity, however it may live in the airy imagining of the Theorist, liveth not in the sober Word of God. So far as the Scriptural account of man's origin is concerned, this notion of Original Righteousness and, of course, of Original Sin, is without foundation ; a pure figment. It is plain that, if the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, as it has been stated, had never been constructed, this figment would never have been conceived. A sober student of the ancient Bible, mindless of modern theories, would never have dreamed of such a thing.

Besides, this notion, when stated in plain English, savors, not only of the imaginary, but also of the impossible. It amounts to this, that God created a perfect man, who was yet more than man. According to the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, now in view, the Baptized become "partakers of the Incarnation," "parts of the Second Adam," existing in something like that intimate and mysterious union with the nature of Christ, which was effected between the human and the Divine, when Christ was made Incarnate by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin; and the original counterpart of this restored mystery in man is found in that "supernatural investment," which was added to his nature at Creation. To make this latter Idea consistent, therefore, this "Supernatural investment," this Original Righteousness, must be, not the mere presence of Christ among His disciples, but that same intimate and mysterious Union of the Divine Word with their natures by the power of the Holy Ghost, which is alleged to be restored in and by Baptism. And this, evidently, is the Idea entertained by the Advocates of this Theory. I repeat, then, this supposes that God created and endowed a perfect man, who was yet more than man; and this is really the figment of an impossibility. God may be said to be in man by an Image of Himself, but

not by an actual impartation of Himself. His rational and moral attributes are communicable in the sense of being imitable ; and He may “ dwell in the humble and contrite spirit,” as He dwelt in the Ancient Tabernacle ; but His nature is incommunicable, and His dwelling in the Soul does not make Him a part of the Soul, any more than His dwelling in the Tabernacle made Him a part of the Tabernacle. The Heavens, it is said, may be imaged in a dew-drop ; but they cannot be in a dew-drop by commingling with it their substance. So God may be imaged in the Soul ; but He cannot be in the Soul by a literal commingling of any portion of Himself with its substance. Let there be no misapprehension here. I deny not the possibility of a miraculous union of the Divine nature with the human. Such a union has already been effected in the mystery of our “ Emmanuel.” What I deny is—the possibility of such a union, consistently with its subject’s continuing a mere man. Such a union would make its subject a God-man ; in some sense a true Christ, able to make satisfaction for sin ; a consequence, which in truth flows from the Theory in view. It is wiser to cleave to the simple statements of the Bible on this subject. Originally, man was created simply and perfectly man ; and in the likeness of God, in so far as he was of a rational and moral nature and perfectly

holy. He was not a being compounded of this perfect man and an added "supernatural investment," or "communication of the Divine nature." And by the fall, he lost, not what had never been given him, but what he had received, his likeness to God, his original Righteousness, in the true Scriptural sense of the terms ; and now, this loss can be repaired only by the atoning work of Christ and the renewing work of the Holy Ghost.

Again ; such an added "supernatural investment" as that, which is alleged, would have been a singular departure from the analogy of God's creating work in all its other particulars. When He created the other orders of being, He made them, as we are told, each "after his kind," and perfect in its kind ; dependent on many other things, yet perfectly distinct from all other things. So, when He created Angels, those "Sons of God," those "morning stars," that "sang together and shouted for joy" when the corner-stone of the world was laid ; we have no intimation that He created them otherwise than "after *their* kind," and perfect in their kind ; *mere* angels ; dependent on God, indeed, yet not God, nor any part of them God, but specifically distinct beings. Why, then, should we suppose that *man* was an anomaly, an exception to this evidently general, and otherwise universal, rule of creation ? The supposition is

manifestly unreasonable as well as gratuitous. *Man* also was created "after his kind," and perfect in his kind : *mere* man ; dependent on God, yet not God, nor any part of him God ; but a perfectly distinct being ; conformed in all respects to our conceptions of distinct genus and species.

Moreover, were it possible to originate such a being as the Theory makes the first man, how greatly would this embarrass the already profoundly difficult question of the origin of Evil in our world ! For what purpose could the added "supernatural investment," if possible, have been given to man, when withheld from angels, except to keep man from such a fall as that into which angels had already plunged ? Where was the inward Divinity, when the subtle tempter glozed in the ear of the primal mother, in the whisper of that artful falsehood, "Eat, and ye shall *not* die ; but shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" ? Supposing man so singularly endowed. of what use was then the awful gift ? On the Scriptural ground, that man was simply man, made strong to stand, yet left free to fall, we can conceive the mode, though we may not the reason, of the origin of Evil in our world. But on the ground of this Theory, the question loses us in utter darkness ; yea, amid the awfulness of a reluctant yet unavoidable arraignment of God ! The difficulties of unquestionable

Scripture on this point are sufficiently great ; but those of this Theory are infinitely greater ; and we come, with increased certainty, to the conclusion, that the Bible is an utter stranger to the Idea of such a peculiarity in man, and therefore to that notion of Original Righteousness and Original Sin, which has now been examined.

2. But, this Theory deals not only with the *Creation*, but also with the *Fall* of man. I add, it derives as little support from the Scriptural account of the Fall as it does from that of the Creation.

The account of the Creation, in the second chapter of Genesis, closes with the remark that “they were both *naked*, . . . and were not ashamed.” That of the Fall, in the third chapter, concludes with this : “The eyes of both of them were opened and they knew that they were *naked*. And they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons.” Gen. 2 : 25 ; 3 : 7. And after the sad catastrophe, when they had “hid themselves among the trees of the garden,” and when “Adam heard the voice of the Lord,” calling, “Where art thou ?” he replied : “I heard Thy voice in the garden, and I was *afraid*, because I was *naked*.” Gen. 3 : 8-10. Now, it is undeniable, that the nakedness here mentioned in the second chapter, and that discovered in the third, are identical. If the

former were bodily, so was the latter; and if the latter were spiritual, so was the former. And yet, with plain reference to these primeval scenes, and by way of supporting the Theory of Original Righteousness and of Original Sin, one of its advocates, in part conjecturally and in part positively, argues thus: "Whereas we have gained under the Gospel what we lost in Adam, and Justification is a reversing of our forfeiture, and a robe of Righteousness is what Christ gives, perchance a Robe is what Adam lost." . . . "Of this he was stripped, by sinning, as of a covering, and shrank from the sight of himself." * This, it must be re-

* Newman, on Justification, p. 179. The whole sentence stands thus: "Whereas we have gained under the Gospel what we lost in Adam, and Justification is a reversing of our forfeiture, and a robe of Righteousness is what Christ gives, perchance a Robe is what Adam lost. If so, what is told us of what he lost will explain what it is we gain. Now the peculiar gift which Adam lost is told us in the Book of Genesis; and it certainly seems to have been a supernatural clothing. He was stripped of it by sinning, as of a covering, and shrank from the sight of himself."

It may be well to add the following extracts from the same work as farther illustrations of the view here given of Original Righteousness and Original Sin.

"The Catholic fathers, as Bishop Bull has collected their testimony, teach that the principle of Sanctity in Adam, to which was attached the gift of immortality, was something *distinct from and above* his human nature. That nature, indeed, did look toward such a perfection, but could not in itself reach it. *Without* this heavenly possession, man was not able to keep the law according to the covenant of life; but *with* it he could serve God acceptably and gain the reward set before him." P. 182.

"Whatever else Adam had by *Creation*, this seems to have been one

membered, is spoken, not of our loss of holiness, or the Image of God, and of our recovery of that holiness, or of our likeness to Him, but of an alleged forfeiture and restoration of something "over and above nature," a "supernatural investment," in the possession of which consisted Original Righteousness, and in the forfeiture of which stood Original Sin, in the sense contended for by the Theory. Let us see what this makes of the account of the Fall.

Upon his disobedience, Adam found himself, says the Theory, "stripped," not merely of "actual inherent holiness," but of the "something over and above nature," wherewith God had clothed his soul; and, being thus stripped, he discovered his nakedness and "shrank from the sight of himself." The nakedness, then, which this stripping caused,

main gift, or rather, that in which all the others were included, the presence of God the Holy Ghost in him." . . . "This was his clothing; this he lost by disobedience; this Christ has regained for us." P. 183.

"It is an angelic glory, which good spirits honor, which devils tremble at, and which we are bound reverently to cherish, with a careful abstinence from sin and with the sacrifice of good works. Well, then, may prophets and apostles exult in it as the great gift of a Divine mercy, as the rich garment of Salvation, and the enjeweled robe of Righteousness;" . . . "as 'Christ in us' and 'upon us' and around us, as if it were a light streaming from our hearts, pervading the whole man, iawrapping and hiding the lineaments and members of our fallen nature, circling round us, and returning inward to the centre from which it issues." P. 184.

These Extracts may be very pious and very poetical; but, as theology, they are Romish to the core.

and which, on being discovered, made him "*afraid*," was not *bodily*, but *spiritual*; it was his fallen humanity deprived of that "Robe" of Divinity, which had constituted his Original Righteousness. But, as was this discovered nakedness *after* the Fall, such also was the undiscovered nakedness *before* the Fall. The certainty of this is indisputable. Before the Fall, "they were naked and not ashamed." After the Fall, "they knew that they were naked," . . . and were "afraid, and hid themselves." Of the identity of the nakedness in these two scenes, common sense knows no doubt. Thus, then, we have it; man was equally and in the same sense naked, both before and after the Fall; and as this nakedness was *spiritual*, caused by "stripping" off the Divine "Robe" of his Original Righteousness, so we have man forfeiting by the Fall a Righteousness which he had never possessed, "stripped" of a "Robe," in which God had never clothed him. If, however, the nakedness before the Fall were *bodily*, the absence of *literal* clothing,—and who doubts that this is the true sense,—then again is the Theory convicted of a gratuitous assumption while engaged in the solemn work of attempting to interpret the Oracles of God; turning the actually literal into the figurative whenever it suits its purpose, as easily as, for the same reason, it can turn the truly

figurative into the literal. The *literal* nakedness, for which *holy* innocence cared not, but which made conscious *guilt* "afraid" and seek an *artificial* covering, is here, by a mere fiction in Theology, converted into the "stripping" of Adam's inner man of its Divine "Robe," its "supernatural investment!" The mere statement of the absurdity is its best refutation.

3. Having thus shewn that the Theory has no foundation in the Scriptural account of the Creation and the Fall, we may expect to find the Articles of our Church as much a stranger to the Theory as the Scriptures are. And such is the state of the case. Turn to the Standards and read in the Ninth Article.

"Original *Sin* standeth—not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but—it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from Original *Righteousness*, and is, of his own nature, inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit. . . . And this *infection* of nature doth remain; yea, in them that are regenerated."

This Article is, indeed, directed against the Pelagian heresy; but it is none the less fatal to this Theory of Baptismal Regeneration. Original

Sin and Original *Righteousness* are moral opposites. An *actual* definition of the one is a *virtual* definition of the other. How, then, does the Article define Original *Sin*, that state, in which "man"—not merely the individual, but *man*, the *Race*, "is very far gone"—*quam longissime*, utterly gone—"from" its opposite, "Original *Righteousness*?" Does it say that this sin stands in the loss of "a supernatural investment," of a mysterious Divine gift, added to our nature? No; but, that it is the loss of man's own holiness; that it "standeth in the fault and corruption of our nature;" and that it is "an infection of nature which remains even in the regenerate." Such, then, being the definition, which the Article gives, of Original Sin, the direct opposite is the definition of Original Righteousness; for, the two states, either of them being defined, mutually define each other. As, therefore, "Original Sin standeth in the fault and corruption of our nature," "inclining us to evil," so Original Righteousness stood in the faultlessness and soundness of our nature, inclining the first man to good; and this Original Righteousness is but another name for that "actual inherent holiness," that Image of God, in which the first man was created. Thus the Theory and the Article are at war. Let us draw more distinctly into view the several points in the conflict.

According to the Theory, Original Righteousness stood, not in "actual inherent holiness," or the likeness of God, but in an added "supernatural investment." According to the Article, it stood, not in any added "supernatural investment," but in "actual inherent holiness," or likeness to God. And then, according to the Theory, Original Sin standeth, not "in the fault and corruption of our nature," but in the forfeiture of an original Divine gift, superadded to nature ; while, according to the Article, it standeth, not in the forfeiture of any such added gift, but in the very "fault and corruption of our nature" itself. So openly, and to the Theory so fatally, do the two clash.

This, however, is not the whole of the conflict. If, according to the Theory, Original Sin stand in the alleged forfeiture, then, when the forfeit is recovered in Baptism, as the Theory teaches, Original Sin no longer remains. By the Theory, Original Sin and the gift in Baptism are opposites. Where the one is the other is not. But the Article teaches that Original Sin does remain "even in the regenerate." It remains, identical with that lingering "infection of nature," the deep power of which renders our sanctification progressive, the often slow, and the too often interrupted movement of our spiritual life. That there is such a thing as this progressive sanctification, the Theory

admits, though the theorists miscall it "progressive justification." But the Theory itself denies, what the Article affirms, that Original Sin remains after Baptism. In truth, the Theory is at irreconcilable war both with the Bible, and with the standards of our Church as planted on the Bible. There is no such Original Righteousness, nor any such Original Sin as is here feigned. The Theory, indeed, admits what we understand by the "Image of God," or His rational and moral likeness in man; but it adds to the doctrine of the Bible its own peculiarities, which are yet not mere additions, but irreconcilable differences, nay, virtual contradictions.

I have dwelt thus long on this notion of Original Righteousness and Original Sin, because it is the really imaginary foundation, on which the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, now in view, seeks to rest itself; and because, to demonstrate that this foundation is imaginary is, at the same time, to demonstrate that the Theory, which seeks to rest on it, is unscriptural. This Theory has no other foundation. It is bound to a baseless idea of Original Righteousness and Original Sin; and, with the unsettling of this idea, it falls. As there was no such supernatural gift as that, alleged to have been forfeited by the Fall, so there is no such supernatural gift to be restored in Baptism. This holds true, however you may fashion, vary, or

modify the notion of that supernatural gift, so long as you keep it distinct and different from that original holiness, or Image of God, in which man was created. The moment you bring it down, so as to make it no longer a Divine thing added to the mere perfect man, but identical with his perfection, his original holiness, the likeness of God in him, that moment you come upon a different foundation, and the whole system of Biblical Theology receives a different shaping. The moment you cease modifying the notion which I have examined, and adopt the obvious teaching of the Bible, that Original Righteousness was nothing else than that "actual inherent holiness," the moral likeness of God in man,—that moment you step from a foundation of fiction, upon a foundation of fact; you leave the imaginary for the real; you leave that fountain-ERROR, whose dark stream flows on in a religion of alleged miracle in Sacraments, and of palpable superstition in ceremonies, and come to the Spring-Head of TRUTH, whose living waters descend to us in a religion of Spiritual doctrine in the faith and of Scriptural holiness in the heart.

The simple, yet grand truth, on this point, is, that man was created "in the Image of God," with no additional "supernatural investment;" in "the likeness of God," with no added impartation from God. By creation, he was what we understand by

a truly good and perfect man ; not only good, but "very good," the best of God's handiwork in our world. But by the Fall, his nature was *changed* from perfect to imperfect, from holy to sinful, from the likeness of God to a loss of that likeness. And now, what Christ seeks, in coming into the world, surrounded by the lights of Revelation and the teachings of the Spirit, is, to restore man to the state from which he is fallen, to *change* him back, from imperfect to perfect, from sinful to holy, from the loss of God's Image to a recovery of that Image. He needs no mysterious reinvestiture with a portion of God's nature, but a Scriptural restoration to the perfection of that nature, which God originally gave him. He needs, not a miraculous *addition*, but a spiritual *change*; a change, inscrutable in its mode, but intelligible in its effects; wrought by the Spirit of God in the secrecy of His goings, yet distinctly cognizable in the result of his workings; still, a *change*, and not an *addition*. And this change is enough as well as all that is possible, consistently with the two natures, Divine and human. As the issue of our *literal* resurrection will be, to "fashion our vile bodies into a *likeness* to Christ's glorious Body," and not into parts of that Body itself, so the issue of this spiritual resurrection is, to re-fashion our fallen souls into a *likeness* to His more glorious Godhood, and

not into parts of that Godhood itself. And what more than this can we desire? What more than this can we have, and yet remain simply human?

The way being thus opened, I advance a step towards the direct subject of this Treatise, the true nature of Baptism.

1. And the first consideration, which I submit, is this: that, as the notion of Original Righteousness and Original Sin, which has been examined, as the foundation of a correlative Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, has been shown to be unscriptural, a mere figment of the imagination, so we are left, not only at liberty, but under obligation, to interpret John 3: 5; and other passages on the subject of Baptism, into a correspondence with that other great system of Biblical Theology, which the advocates for the one examined pronounce to be "radically and essentially different" from theirs. Their notion of Original Righteousness and Original Sin having been shown to be without foundation, we are not at liberty to reject that notion, and yet to retain the correlative Theory of Baptismal Regeneration. As consistent interpreters of the Bible, we are bound to reject both, or neither; for they are tied inseparably together, and together they both stand or fall. Next to the being of a God, all Biblical Theology originates in the account which the Bible gives of the creation and

Fall of man. Hence, of necessity, the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, under examination, pushes itself back to that spring of doctrines, and feels among the great facts, which lie gushing there, for some opening, to which it may trace up its own stream ; it goes back to that beginning of systems, and feels among those great foundation-stones for some basis, on which it may rest its own Theory. And the very fact that, in thus going back, it has found a Spring-head, of which the Bible knows nothing ; that it has discovered a foundation-stone, which underlies, not Eden, the primal home of Theology as well as of man, but some structure in that land of dreams, which spreads round about ; the very fact that this Theory, in thus going back, has traced itself to fiction, and based itself on error, proves that the Theory itself is but a figment of error. The true system of Biblical Theology, in thus carrying itself back to its origin, can make no mistake in finding its real Spring-head, its true corner-stone. To suppose the possibility of such a mistake is to suppose as great an absurdity as that, in tracing the sacred Jordan to its source, you might find the spring in that fabled mount, which is said to pour down the infant Ganges towards the scene of his awful deification ; or as that, in seeking the corner-stone of God's holy Temple, you should find it under the gorgeous Pagoda, which

houses the bloody Idol of Juggernaut. The spiritual affinities of Truth are with the true ; those of error only are with the false.

Is it not true, then, that the notion of Original Righteousness and Original Sin, to which this Theory of Baptismal Regeneration traces itself back, *is* a fictitious and unreal thing ? Is it not true that, not only our Article, but the Bible, God's Word, knows nothing of such a notion ; and that this notion is, not only a stranger, but a foreigner and a foe, to the simple, though sublime truths of Revelation ? And if these things are too palpable to be hidden from the open eye, then may we not claim the right, aye, and feel the bond, to set aside from our faith, not only this notion itself, but also its legitimate correlative, Baptismal Regeneration as here understood ? They both belong to the same system of covering, obscuring and corrupting *additions* to the true system of the Bible ; they both belong to a system which is " radically and essentially different " from that of the Bible, not so much by *denying*, as by overlaying, crushing and killing it with their ponderous masses of addition. The whole, therefore, must be heaved off together, or the system of the Bible will find no relief ; its free activities will be perpetually laboring under a mountain.

2. The next consideration, which I submit, in

approaching the true Idea of the nature of Baptism, is this : as the great end, which Christ seeks in saving men, is, not a Divine addition to our nature, but a Scriptural change of our nature ; not our participation in His whole nature, "Body, Soul and Divinity," but our being morally "conformed to His Image" in all holy and heavenly perfectness ; so, whatever else may be His design and our experience in Baptism, it cannot be the working and undergoing of this great, needed change, so far as this change is cognizable by its subject. This is undeniable ; for, in the case of adults, this change, so far as it is knowable, is required of its subject in order to Baptism ; (see our Catechism in reference to this Sacrament ;) and, if they have not this change before they receive Baptism, they receive it "unworthily," and so, in the language of our Twenty-fifth Article, "purchase to themselves," not a blessing but "damnation ;" while, in the case of Infants, this change, so far as it is knowable, cannot be wrought ; for it is a change which becomes conscious to its subject in "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," and which comes out in the life of holy love, and holy obedience, and every other affection of a sanctified nature. We can be conscious of no other saving change than this. But, how can we repent of sin, until we understand and feel what

Sin is, and that we are its perpetrators? or how can we believe, until we know and approve that, in which we are to believe; or Him, in whom we are to repose our faith? And how can we feel holy love, or render holy obedience, or exercise any affection of a holy nature, until the springs of these things are reopened within us? All this is clearly impossible; and therefore, whatever else may be wrought in Infant baptism, this conscious change cannot be wrought.

This statement is not, with us, mere private opinion. Our Church, in her Catechism, that system of rudiments, with which she seeks to imbue the minds of her children, has so decided. Having taught that "repentance, whereby they forsake sin, and faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God," are "required," or are prerequisites, in those who are baptized; she asks, "Why, then, are Infants baptized when, by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them;" that is, cannot feel the Repentance, nor exercise the faith, which are required? And her answer is, "Because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." Their natural or appointed guardians answer for them; and this lays them, with increased solemnity, under the blessed obligation to do what is required, the

moment they become capable of it. Of it in Infancy they are not capable. This teaching of the Church is based on the very reason and nature of things. In the baptized infant, the mind takes no cognizance of what is sacramentally passing. It is utterly incapable of understanding what is done for it, or of comprehending a single truth that is uttered over it. And it is impossible that the moral nature, or character of the soul should be consciously changed, except as it is put intelligently in motion ; made to act, to think, to understand, to repent, to believe, to pray, to strive, to hope, to love, in short, to put forth its powers in the apprehension and use of those truths, in which the Spirit comes, and which bring to view God and the realities of the spiritual world. This point needs no further argument. The great change required in consciousness of every actual sinner cannot be wrought in Infant Baptism, whatever else may be passing in that Sacrament.

We should now be prepared for entering on an examination of the principal texts, which relate to Baptism, were it not that, having dealt, thus far, with the great principles of the case, without stopping, or turning aside, to notice objections, or matters incidental to the subject, it may be well to spend some time, before proceeding to such an examination, in disposing of certain suggestions,

which may be started by what has been said. This, however, must be reserved for subsequent chapters. For the present, let us rest in what, I venture to think, may be considered as settled ; with our views of Original Righteousness and Original Sin distinctly defined ; the two essentially diverse Systems of Theology, to which different Theories on those points have given rise, clearly indicated ; and a starting point fixed, from which we may look into the Scriptures for the true Idea of Christian Baptism.

In closing the present chapter, it is of great importance that we feel the practical relations of what has been said. If it all terminated in mere speculation ; if the views, which have been discussed, could have no influence on our moral characters and on our daily religion ; on the character of our Church and on the progress of the Gospel ; I would not spend a breath in giving my thoughts vent. But it is not so. The reason why I have said so much, and spoken so earnestly, is, that the topics discussed are most vital in their influence, and affect most vitally the whole state and destiny of our religion, whether in the individual, or in the mass. These topics, indeed, lie remote from every-day thought ; but they send down their influences upon us with ever-living energy. They are like the sources of a great stream, which lie

among distant, and, to some, inaccessible mountains ; but whose waters reach us for all that, either to delight and bless us, or to overwhelm and sweep us away. According to the views which we adopt of these topics, the Gospel and the Church will prove, to us, full either of simple beauty and perennial life, or of turgid splendor and unsaving show.

CHAPTER II.

CONSIDERATION OF SUGGESTIONS ARISING FROM WHAT HAS BEEN SAID.

BEFORE proceeding to an examination of the principal passages in the Bible, which relate to Baptism, I have promised to consider certain suggestions, which may be started by what has been said. We have seen that the two correlative Ideas of man's fall and recovery, which make these facts consist in the forfeiture and restoration of a mysterious gift, of and from God, "over and above nature," or added to that perfect nature, which was created in the Image of God, are unscriptural, based on mischievous error, and underlying a great system of Theology, which is full of miracle in Sacraments and of Superstition in ceremonies. We have also seen that the view of these points, as given in the Bible, is, that the fall and recovery of man consist in the loss and restoration of that Image of God, wherein he was created; or, in a change of our nature itself, from holiness to sin, and then back from sin to holiness; and that this

view underlies another great system of Theology, a religion of Scriptural Doctrine in the faith, and of Scriptural holiness in the heart. And finally, we have seen that the change, which is now required in us, in order to such recovery of the lost Image of God, is one, which, so far as it is knowable, can not be wrought in the Baptism of Infants.

I. The first suggestion, then, which may be started by these views, is this : although the great change, which every actual sinner needs, can not be fully and consciously wrought on unconscious and unthinking Infancy, yet, may not the *principle*, the *seed* of this transformation, the *germ* of the new life, be then implanted in and by Baptism ; to be afterwards developed and brought into growth, when the infant becomes capable of understanding and feeling truth, and of exercising intelligently repentance and faith ?

1. The answer to this will depend on the meaning, intended to be conveyed in the terms, 'principle', 'seed', 'germ', of which so much is said. Are we to understand by these terms, the substance of the Divine nature, so communicated in Baptism as to become incorporate with the substance of the Soul, and to be developed in future years of intelligence ? If so, this is but another way of stating the very Theory, which has already been examined, and found to be unscriptural and there-

fore without foundation ; the Theory that a Divine addition to our nature is what we have forfeited, and that this addition is what we are to regain. The terms, 'principle', 'seed', 'germ', used in this connection, run into that unscriptural Theology, and away from the Theology of the Bible. As related to that Theory, the 'principle', 'seed', or 'germ', said to be implanted, is nothing less than a part of the Divine Nature itself. What, then, must it become by future development and growth ; if we may suppose such a thing as that the Divine nature is susceptible of development and growth ? Nothing else than itself enlarged. A seed, when it grows ; a germ, when it germinates ; produces, not a different substance, but simply its unfolded self, the growing plant, which, perfect in all its parts, lay in wondrous miniature within the yet ungerminating seed. In like manner, the Divine Seed, or germ ; alleged by this Theory to be implanted in and by Baptism, of and from God, must become, by subsequent development, not a renewed human mind, but simply its own unfolding self, the fuller expanding of that mysterious Divine Embryo. Hence the unscriptural Theology, adverted to, when speaking of Justification as given in Baptism, calls it, among other names, "Christ in us,"—not changing our sinful natures and making us holy, but—"as it were, a

light streaming from our hearts, pervading the whole man, inwrapping and hiding the lineaments and members of our fallen nature, circling round us and returning inward to the centre from which it issues." * And hence the terms, principle, seed, germ, are so frequently used in that Theology, when making the Higher Sacrament of the Eucharist consist mainly in nurturing and developing the mystery implanted in Baptism, by communicating to the recipient "the Body and blood of Christ," inseparably united as these are with His "Soul and Divinity." †

It is true that the Theorists speak of this gift, though originally neither a part of us, nor a change in us, yet as "*tending* to become part of us ;"—as "first *hiding* our deformity and then *removing* it ;‡ as "casting out, or absorbing into itself, our natural mortality and death and corruption ;" and as finally "recreating the Spirit in us to newness of life, and making us "partakers of the Divine nature."§ But here are both the absurdity and the perniciousness of the System. The Spirit of God, by the Truth of God, may *change* our natures into a *likeness* to the Divine ; but how can that which is no part of us, "tend to *become* a part of us ?" How

* Newman on Justif., p. 184.

† Pusey's Sermon, *passim* ; and Tract 67, pp. 216, 238, 239, 253.

‡ Newman on Justif., p. 197.

§ Pusey's Sermon, pp. 7, 9.

can our clothing become our flesh? Besides, to speak of a Divine Gift, which at one time, is said to be increased by fuller influences of itself,* and, at another, is supposed to conform, or absorb us into the Divine nature, is to introduce into Theology a confused and confusing mystery, at once the spring of perplexities, and thus, all the more fruitfully, the parent of Superstitions.

If any should be disposed to hold that this principle, seed, or germ, is not an actual impartation from and of the Divine nature, but a something intermediate between the Divine and the human, and the cause of a subsequent renewing change of the latter,—then I ask, what is that intermediate something, thus in the soul, yet not of the soul; thus from God, yet no part of God? And how is this intermediate something, neither Divine nor human, to be put into subsequent action? Is this subsequent action to be started by religious instruction, by the Holy Spirit in the use of Truth? This cannot be. By the use of Truth in riper years, the Spirit may affect, move, and change the Soul itself; but it cannot animate and put in growth an intermediate something, which is neither the Soul itself, nor an impartation of the Divine nature; which is, in reality, a mere fiction, an intermediate non-entity.

* Tract 67, p. 24.

If it be said, that this principle, or Seed, is the germ of new and holy affections in the soul, which are to be afterwards developed and perfected ; this must mean one of two things, either the germ of new and holy affections, *added to* those, which were in the soul by creation, and which have become depraved by the fall ; or the germ of a *renewal* of these original and depraved affections themselves. If it mean the former, it is manifestly false : for the work of the Holy Spirit, whether at Baptism, or afterwards, does not consist in adding even the germ of new affections to those which belong by Creation to the Soul, but in making these original and now depraved affections themselves new and holy. The Soul can no more have a new, in the sense of an *added*, affection, or moral attribute, than it can have a new, in the sense of an *added*, faculty, or intellectual power. And if it mean the latter, the germ of a *renewal* of the original but now depraved affections of the Soul, than it implies the commencement of that very change, which, as we have seen, our Church in her Catechism, following reason in her dictates, pronounces impossible in Infants ; because the steps in this change are that “repentance and faith,” which “Infants, by reason of their tender age, cannot perform.” It implies the commencement of this change ; for, the moment you pass from the cause, which produces it,

to the effect produced, the *germ* of a change can be nothing else than the change itself *begun* : and if this change may be begun in Infant Baptism, why may it not be completed in that Sacrament? To begin to repent and believe is—simply—to be a penitent believer ; and a penitent believer in Christ is a spiritually changed and renewed being : and thus we have again what our Catechism, speaking in the clear tones of reason, pronounces impossible in Infancy ; repentance, without knowing what is repented of ; and faith, without knowing what is believed.

This point will meet us again at a future stage of the discussion ; but, thus far, we have found, to the terms, principle, seed, germ of life, no sense intermediate between that of an addition and incorporation of the Divine nature to and with the human, and that of a change of our nature itself by the agency of the Holy Spirit ; a change through repentance and faith from sin to holiness ; a change which is wrought by the Spirit in the use of Truth ; a change which can be wrought in those years only of opening intelligence and accountability, which lie forward on the course of life at a greater or less remove from the moment of Infant dedication to God. And to invest those terms with this idea is, of course, to abandon that modified form of the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, designed to be

presented by the suggestion now under consideration.

2. But, clinging still to the form of this suggestion, some may ask ; “Is the renovation of our nature, then, in Infancy, literally impossible ? Have we not, in the Bible, some examples of not only its possibility, but also its actual realization ? Was not Samuel made holy from a child ? Was not Jeremiah “Sanctified from the womb ?” Did it not “please God” to make the Apostle Paul, even “from his mother’s womb,” a “separated,” or holy child ? Was not Timothy an instance of this early sanctification ? And, more especially still, was it not prophesied of John the Baptist, that he should “be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb ?”

In reply to these questions, I shall not attempt to show that the renovation of our nature in Infancy is, with God, a thing literally impossible. And yet, it is important to examine the cases, here cited from the Bible, and to ascertain, if possible, their true meaning. The examination will occupy some time ; but it may, peradventure, be well worth the time required.

(1.) My first remark, then, upon the examples adduced, is this : they do not affect the question before us. They have nothing to do with either the possibility or the impossibility of this renova-

tion in Infancy in and by BAPTISM. Neither Samuel, nor Jeremiah, neither Paul nor Timothy, nor yet John the Baptist, was baptized in Infancy. Like other Jewish children, they were doubtless, with the exception of Timothy, "circumcised the eighth day;" but this does not show that "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" is either the design or the effect of Baptism in Infancy.

(2.) But, not to stand on this, I remark, second, that the Scriptural Idea of being "sanctified from the womb" is not that, implied in the inquiries just made, touching the possible renewal of our sinful nature in Infancy;—but it is that, in which so many things, under the old Dispensation, were said to be "sanctified," that is made relatively holy; as the *persons* of prophets, priests and kings; the Sabbath and the Temple; the instruments and vessels of the Sanctuary; and even houses, fields, animals, and tithes. Lev. 27: 14 *ad fin.* This Sanctification, according to one of the acknowledged senses of the Hebrew term, consisted in being *separated, set apart, devoted*, from common to sacred uses, from our own use to God's; as when a priest was set apart and consecrated to God's service in outward things, without any necessary reference to inward sanctity; or when a field was set apart and consecrated to the support of God's ministry and worship.

In this sense it was, most manifestly, that Samuel was set apart and devoted to the Lord, even before he was conceived in the womb ; 1 Sam. 1 : 10, 11 ; that Jeremiah was “ sanctified before he came forth of the womb ; Jer. 1 : 5 ; and that Paul was “ separated ” unto his Apostleship from his mother’s womb ; ” Gal. 1 : 15 ; in all which there was nothing implied but a *relative, official* devotement to the great future calling of their lives. As to their *real, inward* sanctification, Samuel, we may well believe, received his, while spending his young, but intelligent years in the Temple, hearing the truths of God from aged Eli, when “ the word of the Lord was precious,” because “ in those days there was no open vision ; ” and while living there amid the lights of a freshly-dawning Revelation as they streamed around his own opening, and well instructed mind. 1 Sam. 3 : 1–14. Jeremiah probably received his, when “ the Lord put forth His hand, and touched his mouth, and said : ‘ Behold, I have put my *words* into thy mouth ; ’ ” thus, while furnishing him with his messages as “ a prophet unto the nations,” curing him also of his just expressed childish fears, and giving him the heart of a true man of God and of a courageous servant of the Lord. Jer. 1 : 5–9. And Paul, doubtless, received his when Jesus met the persecutor on his wrathful embassy to Damascus, threw back the curtain of

common light, which had concealed His form, shone out in all the dazzling brightness of "the Sun of Righteousness," and talked with the stricken man in those mighty words, which, rendered quickening by the Spirit, made him feel that it was, indeed, "hard to kick against the pricks." Acts, 26 : 12-18.

In the case of Timothy there seems to have been nothing unusual. Being a semi-Gentile, with a Greek father and a Jewish mother, the latter of whom had, perhaps under St. Paul's ministry, been brought to believe in Christ, he had been well taught in the Scriptures, though we have no account of his baptism, whether in Infancy or in riper years. His "mother Eunice, and his grandmother Lois," being women of "unfeigned faith," had, as the Apostle intimates, "from a child" taught him those "Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto Salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 3 : 14, 15 ; comp. 2 Tim. 1 : 5. Thus, as in numberless other cheering instances, God, by His Spirit, early "Sanctified him through the Truth."

The case of John the Baptist calls for more particular examination. Though not himself baptized, but brought into the Ancient Church by "the seal of circumcision," yet there was a foregoing promise to his father, that he should be "filled with the

Holy Ghost from his mother's womb." Luke, 1 : 15. The pertinency of this case to the questions, which I am answering, will depend, partly, on our interpretation of the note of *time*, here given ; but, chiefly, on the sense which we are to attach to the phrase, "filled with the Holy Ghost."

As to the note of time, then, it is evident, from the cases already examined, that, in the Bible, when any person is said to have been set apart to any office or work "from his mother's womb," or from the time of his *birth*, or *conception*, the meaning is, that, in bringing such person into the world, God had a special design ; that, from his conception, he was, in the Divine purpose, devoted to the office, which he was to fill, or the work, which he was to do ; and that, from the same moment, he was destined to be furnished with the proper qualifications, which that office, or work might require. This note of time, then, settles nothing but the purpose of God in bringing a particular person into the world. It does not fix the time when the qualifications for his office, or work, should be given. In the case of John the Baptist, it means that, in the counsels of God, he was, from his very conception, set apart, not only to the high office of a Priest of the priestly line, but to the higher office of one, greater than the greatest of the prophets, as the immediate Herald of the Son of God ; and

that, from the same time, and in the same counsels, he was assured of the proper qualifications for his office, whenever those qualifications should be needed. "From the womb," it was certain that he would be "filled with the Holy Ghost," to qualify him for his office of heralding in the Son of God, the world's Messiah.

And now, as to the other and chief point in this case, the sense, which we are to attach to the phrase, "filled with the Holy Ghost;"—it will be found, I apprehend, to be a scriptural phrase for that *miraculous gift of Inspiration*, by which prophets, and revealers of God's truth were qualified for their peculiar office, or work; and which, as we know from the case of Balaam and others, had no necessary connection with *the renewing and sanctifying* influences of the Holy Spirit, in His ordinary work of quickening the soul from its death in trespasses and sins to a new and holy life. If this be so, then John was, from his mother's womb, set apart to his singularly high office in the same sense, in which Samuel, and Jeremiah, and Paul were to theirs;—while the change, which made him, like all other saints, renewed and holy in heart, fashioned into the recovered Image of God within him, was doubtless wrought in the ordinary way, amid the early teachings of the Sanctuary, and the faithful instructions of holy parents, blessed by the

quickenings and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. This accounts for the different style of the prophecy before his conception, and of the historical remark after his circumcision. According to the prophecy, he was to be "*filled* with the Holy Ghost." According to the history, "the child grew and *waxed* strong in Spirit." That prophecy foretold his special Inspiration, which, whenever it should be given, was to be *full*, incapable of *waxing*, or increase. That history showed that God's blessing rested on the early religious training, which he received, giving him a new inward life, which *was* capable of waxing strong.

Let us proceed, then, more largely to inquire whether the words, "filled with the Holy Ghost," be not, as I have intimated, a Scriptural phrase for the miraculous gift of Inspiration. Mark, then, what was said of the parents of John, soon after the delivery of the prophecy concerning him. Of his mother, when receiving the visit of Mary, it was said, "Elizabeth was *filled with the Holy Ghost*;" And then, to shew what was the nature and design of this gift, she instantly passed into the sublime strains of her prophetic song. Luke, 1 : 41-45. Of his father, when, at the circumcision of the child, his mysteriously bound "tongue was loosed," it was said : "And . . . Zacharias was *filled with the Holy Ghost*;" and then again, to

show what the gift meant, he too was forthwith rapt away into the loftiness of a prophet's utterance. Luke, 1 : 67-79. So, too, of Peter, when taken out of the "hold," in which he had been imprisoned ; and questioned as to the "power, or name," by which he had healed the cripple and "preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead ;" it was said, that, being "*filled with the Holy Ghost*," he at once fell into that inspired discourse, in which he boldly rebuked the first persecution. Acts, 4 : 8-12. Again, when Ananias was sent with a Divine message to the stricken persecutor, announcing his election as "a chosen vessel" unto the Lord, and that one of the objects for which Jesus had "appeared unto him in the way," was, that he might be "*filled with the Holy Ghost*;" it was recorded that the new Apostle, the moment he was recovered from bodily exhaustion, "straightway preached Christ in the Synagogues" of Damascus, "that He is the Son of God." Acts, 9 : 17-20. Once more ; when "Elymas the Sorcerer withstood" Paul at Paphos, "seeking to turn away the deputy," Sergius Paulus, "from the faith "which he was so desirous of receiving ; the opposition aroused the earnest Apostle ; the sacred afflatus came upon him, in its power ; and it is recorded that "then, Saul, who is also called Paul, *filled with the Holy Ghost*, set his eyes on "the crafty gainsayer," and

said : "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, child of the devil, enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord ?" and then, the "mist and darkness," which "immediately fell" on the banned opponent, was a sufficient token that he, who uttered the ban, spake indeed, under the impulses of a Divine Inspiration. Acts, 13 : 9-11.

And now, with all these cases, compare what was said of the Twelve, on the Day of Pentecost. When, "suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of a rushing, mighty wind ;" and when "cloven tongues, like as of fire, sat upon each of them ;" it was said : "And they were all *filled with the Holy Ghost* ;" and then, to shew what was meant by the gift, they immediately "began to speak with other tongues, *as the Spirit gave them utterance.*" Acts, 2 : 2-4. Here, then, is a case of the miraculous gift of Inspiration, defined by Inspiration itself. It was the power of speaking "as the Spirit gave them utterance." And yet the phraseology here is identical with that in all the other cases. Elizabeth and Zacharias, Paul and the Twelve, were, as the Infant John was to be, simply "*filled with the Holy Ghost.*" Doubtless, therefore, in all the cases, the gift was the same. It was, in all the cases, the power of "speaking as the Spirit gave them utterance." The Idea is—that of being filled with the impulses of a Divine Inspiration.

Concerning this gift, then, it is important to remember, that, though generally imparted to "Holy men of old," yet it was sometimes given to wicked men, and therefore had no necessary connection with the quickening and sanctifying Influences of the Spirit ; and that it was not always, if ever, an indesinent, or uninterrupted gift ; but was evidently imparted, from time to time, as occasion called for its exercise. Thus, Elizabeth and Zacharias were made prophets of a grand but transient occasion ; while even the Twelve, as the chief Evangelists and teaching prophets of the then opening Dispensation of Christ, were manifestly not always under the power of their awful gift.

There is, indeed, one circumstance, which may seem to take the case of John out of analogy with that of others. If his gift were like that of Elizabeth and Zacharias, of Paul and the Twelve, as the language, in which it was expressed, would seem to indicate, why did he not, like them, in proof of his gift, fall, as soon as he could speak, into the utterance of prophecy, or into the use of tongues ? But this query has nothing more than a seeming force, as may be seen by these two replies.

1. The *Child*-prophet was not a *man*-prophet. Though we were to admit, therefore, that his inspiration came *very early*, yet we should not look for very early exercises of his gift. The favored

child, while others wondered in their hearts what lay within him, might well be expected to remain a child and to repress his awful gift, until retirement and approaching manhood had given him something like credit and customary authority over his contemporaries. But, 2. It is far from certain that his inspiration came very early. The first that we hear of his inspiration, was, after Jesus had "dwelt in a city, called Nazareth," for more than a quarter of a century, in subjection to His Mother and reputed father. *Then* it was, that "the Word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness;" and that he began to "preach the baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins;" and to proclaim the approach of the great Messiah, saying: "I, indeed, baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Luke, 3 : 2, 16. He knew that a Messiah was at hand; but who that Messiah was he seems not to have known, until after he had baptized him in the person of Jesus, Matt. 11 : 2, 3, when "Jesus himself began to be about Thirty years of age;" Luke, 3 : 23, and when John was of course full Thirty. It is plain, then, that the prophecy, which foretold John's inspiration, did not fix the *date* of the gift. From the analogy of persons

“separated,” or. “sanctified from the womb,” it is evident that John was born for an end special to himself; and that this end was to preach “the baptism of Repentance,” and to herald in the great Messiah. The phrases,—“separated from the womb,” “sanctified from the womb,” “filled with the Holy Ghost from the womb,” mean no more than that God thus early signified a special Divine purpose in the birth of the persons thus distinguished, without tying Himself to *time* in the actual bestowment of their miraculous gifts. It was “from the womb” that their Special designation was made known, or determined; while the impulses of Inspiration were bestowed only as occasions demanded their exercise. Facts in the other cases bear out this view; and I venture to say that facts in the case of John are no less decisive. His case belongs to their class. It is a class, which comprehends a peculiar list of Scriptural characters. John’s special designation to his peculiarly high destiny, that of the highest of the Prophets, was made known “from the womb” with a correspondingly higher strain of prediction; and “from the womb” he was evidently a remarkable child; but we have no reason for supposing that the promised fulness of Inspiration came upon him until near the time, when Christ Himself, after His own period of withdrawment from the public eye,

and of quiet abiding the arrival of the customary term of authorized priesthood, was preparing to come forth before the world, the glorious Teacher and Messiah of the nations.

Such being the view, to which we are brought, of the case of John the Baptist, I cannot repress my surprise that some modern Commentators, by no means inclined to that Theory of Baptismal regeneration, which is here opposed, cite the prophecy concerning John, as a proof that, for the purpose of changing our sinful nature, the Holy Ghost may be communicated to the Infant even while in its mother's womb ; thus, in fact, giving it its second birth before it has received its first ! The truth is, this case, if it have been rightly studied, has nothing to do with the question before us. It is as irrelevant thereto as were those of Samuel and Jeremiah, of Paul and Timothy ; and the inference, urged on us by these the strongest cases on record, is, that the Bible, so far as it teaches by example, teaches nothing of the renewing and sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit during the period of unconscious and unintelligent Infancy.

3. I pass, then, to another point. Those, who press the suggestion now under consideration, may urge one further inquiry. Does not the Bible teach, if not by *example*, yet in *doctrine*, that the gift of the Holy Spirit may be imparted without

the use of Truth, and therefore during unintelligent Infancy? This will lead to an examination of another class of passages, which, as connected with this subject, it is desirable rightly to understand. Much of the Theology, shadowed in the suggestion before us, is traceable to what the Bible says of "the gift of the Holy Ghost;" of Christ being in the Christian; in short, of God, dwelling in the heart of every true believer.

Before enumerating any of the passages, in which this leading Idea occurs, it is proper to set aside all those, in which the gift of the Spirit implies simply Inspiration, or other miraculous endowment; and which belong not to our subject, because they have no connection with the renovating change of our sinful nature. If in passing, however, I advert to some of them, it will be not only for the purpose of shewing that no such connection exists, but also to prepare for a right understanding of those passages, in which the gift of the Spirit means an *ordinary* gift, or in which union with Christ and a partaking of a Divine nature imply the common privilege of all true Christians.

Scattered through the Bible, then, are various passages, in which God, in all the persons of His mysterious Trinity, is said to be, or to dwell, in His believing and sanctified children; and this in-

dwelling must, in all such cases, be considered as the peculiar gift of His Spirit. The following are some of the most prominent of these passages.

Passages, which speak of the indwelling of God, the Father : "Thus saith the High and lofty One," "I dwell with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit." Isa. 57 : 15. "Ye are the Temple of the living God ; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them." 2 Cor. 6 : 16. "Precious promises ; that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine nature." 2 Pet. 1 : 4.

Passages, which speak of the indwelling of God, the Son : "Abide in me and I in you." John, 15 : 4. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Gal. 3 : 27. "Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" 2 Cor. 13 : 5. "This mystery among the Gentiles ; which is Christ in you, the hope of Glory." Col. 1 : 27. "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be formed in you." Gal. 4 : 19.

Passages, which speak of the indwelling of God, the Holy Ghost : "This spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive." John, 7 : 39. "The Spirit of Truth ; He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." John, 14 : 17. "Know ye not that your body is the Temple of the

Holy Ghost, which is in you?" 1 Cor. 6 : 19.
"Be filled with the Spirit." Eph. 5 : 18.

In these and similar passages, we recognize that gift of the Spirit, whereby, as Christians, we have what is meant by the indwelling of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; and the question, which they present, is, What *is* that meaning? They certainly mean something very serious and very important. What, then, *is* that gift of the Spirit, by which this indwelling is effected and realized? It is obvious that, however differently, in different places, the Idea may be expressed, it is, in all cases, one and the same thing. If we suppose it possible that the gift may be communicated to infants, still, it will not be conceived of as one thing in them and another in adults ; nor as one thing before baptism and another after baptism. In all cases, and at all times, it must be one and the same. With this remark, I proceed to the Inquiry.

(1.) In the first place, then, whatever these passages mean, they do not connect the gift of the Spirit with *baptism*, as the means. One of these passages, indeed, as well as another not yet cited, seems to connect the gift with Baptism ; but the connection, I apprehend, is in the appearance only, not in reality.

(a) Let us look, first, at the passage not yet

cited. It is part of the address of Peter to his countrymen on the Day of Pentecost ; that Day of wondrous effusion on the Church of the gifts of the Spirit in miracle and inspiration. When those, to whom the bold Apostle had been preaching the Gospel, "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power," were "pricked in their heart," and began to cry out, "What shall we do?" Peter replied : "repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of Sins ; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts, 2 : 38.

To understand what is meant by the gift here promised, it is important to mark the order of events, as here recorded. Peter had been preaching to his countrymen the Gospel of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified." This preaching had been accompanied by the silent, but powerfully convincing and quickening influences of the Holy Spirit in His ordinary gifts of grace. As a consequence of this, while the preacher was yet speaking, "they were pricked in their hearts ;" their consciences were thoroughly awakened : they felt the first deep, secret movements of a new life ; and were constrained to cry out : "What shall we do?" To this inquiry the preacher replied : "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins ; and ye shall re-

ceive the gift of the Holy Ghost." With this direction, as enjoining "Repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," the things required in order to baptism, they forthwith complied, because, under the silent influence of the Spirit, accompanying the spoken word, their hearts were already pierced with a sense of their heinous sins, and already convinced that He, whom they had crucified, was none other than their own true Christ. They did, therefore, repent; they did believe in the name of Jesus Christ; and in this repentance and faith they were at once baptized in seal of the promise of forgiven sin. Hence, it is added: "They that gladly received his word, were baptized." Why did they gladly receive his word? Because the Holy Spirit quickeningly and movingly inclined their hearts. And why were they baptized? Because, being thus moved by the Spirit, they felt that true repentance, and that lively faith—that "*believing* with all the *heart*"—which were indispensable prerequisites to their baptism.

But, if they had already received the ordinary gift of the Spirit, if this ordinary grace preceded baptism, what means the added promise, that, upon being baptized, they should "receive the gift of the Holy Ghost?" I reply; it evidently means, that they also, like the Twelve, should become sharers

in those *special* endowments, which they had just seen so miraculously shed upon the Infant Church. The *ordinary* grace of the Spirit is silent, untraceable. It associates itself with the Truth, and so enters the mind in the unnoticed form of the mind's own operations. This grace they had already effectually received, though as yet they stopped not to reflect on its workings. Now, they were to receive something remarkable, their share in the *miraculous* endowments of the Spirit. As the *ground* of his promise, therefore, the Apostle refers to the prophecy of Joel, which had already begun to be fulfilled amid the opening marvels of the Pentecost; and adds, "The promise is unto *you* and to your *children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." The promise was to the Jews first; they therefore might well hope to be among the earliest sharers in this its most august fulfillment. .Joel, 2 : 28-32; Acts, 2 : 17-21, 39.

In its main features, this prophecy by Joel was unquestionably a prediction of the *extraordinary* gifts of the Holy Ghost, as actually shed upon the Church at this Pentecostal season. It may, indeed, be admitted that the prophecy included the ordinary, as well as the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; that it is a promise from God to the Christian Church of the abiding influences of that Spirit

in measures before unknown ; that it is, in fact, the charter, by which this Church now holds her permanent endowment, in all its richness, of the never-departing presence of the Illuminator, Sanctifier and Comforter. This view I am by no means disposed to controvert. What I press upon the consideration of the thinking, as well as devout, is this ; that so far as the case in hand is concerned, the *ordinary* gift of the Spirit, which the prophecy includes, was actually shed on those, whom Peter was addressing, before they were baptized. Without that previous ordinary gift, they could not have had, what we are sure they realized in order to their baptism, "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ ;" and therefore, the additional "gift of the Holy Ghost," which Peter assured them should *follow* their baptism, must be understood of those miraculous endowments, which also Joel predicted, and for which that Pentecost was so memorable. The *ordinary* grace was not, either by the prophecy, or by its fulfillment, tied to *Baptism* as its *effect* ; for it unquestionably *preceded* Baptism, and accompanied the preaching of the Gospel. The *extraordinary* gift was promised by the Apostle, as a bestowment, which should *follow* baptism ; though it was not promised by Peter, as the *effect* of baptism, any more than the "fiery tongues" were

predicted by Joel, as the effect of baptism. They were *special* gifts, *Sovereignly* bestowed.

This passage, then, yields no support to the Theory, which teaches that the *ordinary* gift of the Spirit, as the common privilege of the children of God, is communicated in Baptism.

(b) Let us look, now, at the other passage, referred to as having been already cited. It is that of Gal. 3 : 27. "As many of you, as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." What I have just said will help us to its true sense, by leading us to take into our view the antecedents to the baptism there mentioned, as well as the baptism itself.

After having spoken of the Law as "our School-master to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith," by the operation of which law and the accompanying influences of the Spirit those, whom he addressed, had become "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," the Apostle adds : "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." The meaning of the whole is, that the Law, preached of course, in due connection with the Gospel, and blessed by the renewing influences of the Spirit, had been the means of bringing the Galatians to Christ for justification by faith ; and that, in this faith, they had been baptized into Christ, or in His name. More fully

expressed, they had been baptized in the one great name, of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with a profession of a true faith in the Trinity ; and, as the result of their previous renewing unto repentance and faith, they had become, as the Apostle styles them, "Children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." As the result of that renewing change,—a change professed and sealed in baptism, they had "*put on Christ*;" or, as the same Apostle expresses the Idea in another place, they had become "conformed to the image" of Christ. Rom. 8 : 29. The advocates of the Theory of baptismal Regeneration, as here understood, urge that the Galatians "put on Christ" by a literal incorporation of His incarnate nature with their own, effected by the Spirit and the water, as joint agents, at and in baptism. But, taking the whole account in its connection, it not only gives no support to this dogma, but furnishes no proof of any inward, spiritual change effected in and by Baptism as its Instrument. "Putting on Christ" means being made *like* Christ ; having the same "*mind* which was also in Him ;" Phil. 2 : 5. being "conformed to His Image ;" made "children of God by faith in Him ;" and this was effected by the Holy Spirit, using the Law and its accompanying preaching, in bringing the Galatians to Christ for justification by faith, and thus making them God's believing children. "*As many of you,*"

says the Apostle, "as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." That is, those who had been brought to baptism, had generally been thus brought because they had previously been truly converted and conformed to their Saviour. Some of them might have proved backsliders from their first soundness and constancy in the faith ; but, on the whole, they were true Christians. Such was the power of persecution and opposition, at that time warring against Christ, that few indeed could be brought to confess their faith in Him by Baptism, unless they had been previously and thoroughly penetrated with the power of His Truth, and, in strongly encouraging measures, conformed to His image. This, evidently, is the full meaning of the passage ; and it is a weighty and precious meaning : it comes up fully to the dignity of the connected discourse : it has in it no frigidness, but is warm with all the vital meaning of the Gospel.

If, then, these passages which, at first sight, seem to connect the gift of the Spirit with baptism, do, on closer examination, virtually disprove such connection ; much more strongly must all the other passages which I have cited tend to the same disproof ; for they carry not the remotest allusion to baptism.

(2.) In the second place, I reply : that, whatever the cited passages may mean, and whatever be that

gift of the Spirit, by which the indwelling of God with his children is realized, not only the passages just examined, but the main teachings of the New Testament, show that the ordinary grace of the Spirit, as quickening the soul from its "death in trespasses and sins," is uniformly imparted *before* baptism.

This, I apprehend, was conclusively shown in one of the chapters, introductory to this discussion. It was there seen, that the uniform order, in the work of the ministry and its fruits, was, 1. Preaching the Gospel; 2. Conversion to Christ by repentance and faith; 3. Baptism. This last, we know, was not administered to adults but on evidence, or profession, of foregoing repentance and faith; and these graces, these Spiritual movements in the inner life of the soul, constitute the elements of the great change from sin to holiness. Unless, therefore, one be bold enough to say, that this change may be wrought without the agency of the Holy Ghost, he must admit that, in all the cases referred to, this agency and its result preceded baptism.

In one instance, we find that both the ordinary and the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit preceded baptism. It was that of Peter's preaching in the house of Cornelius. "While Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them, which heard the

Word." Acts, 10 : 44. This gift must have included both the ordinary and the extraordinary grace : the ordinary, because its recipients were straightway baptized, and because this would not have been done had there not been evidence in them of that repentance and faith, which were the prerequisites to baptism, and which are in all cases the work of the Spirit : and the extraordinary, because, before their baptism, they were "heard to speak with tongues," or in those languages, which were taught by the immediate inspiration of the Spirit, as at the Day of Pentecost.

In two other instances, the ordinary and silent, the quickening and renewing grace of the Spirit preceded baptism ; while the extraordinary and sensible, the special and miraculous gifts of the Spirit followed that ordinance.

(a.) The one of these instances is found in the account of Philip's ministry at Samaria. The Holy Spirit having first, by His quickening grace blessed the preaching of the Evangelist to the conversion of the Samaritans unto the true faith, they were at once baptized. Here was the ordinary gift before baptism. After their baptism, two of the Apostles went down and "laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." That this was the extraordinary gift we know, because Simon Magus, "*seeing* that the Holy Ghost was given, offered

money," in the impious hope of purchasing the power to convey so splendid a "Gift of God," and of thereby winning for himself higher fortune or fame than he had yet acquired by his Sorceries. Acts, 8 : 4-20. Here, then, was the ordinary gift before baptism ; and the extraordinary gift after baptism.

(b.) The other of these instances is found in the account of Paul's preaching at Ephesus, when he had "passed thither through the upper coasts." He found there "about twelve" believing disciples ; and said to them : "Have you received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" Literally, "having believed," or when ye believed, "did ye receive the Holy Ghost?" Their reply, as we have it in our translation, was : "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." They had been baptized by the herald John only :—now, therefore, they were "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus ;" and when "Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Acts, 19 : 1-7. Here also the extraordinary gift was bestowed after baptism, as the ordinary grace had evidently been before. I say, "evidently ;" because, though hitherto unbaptized in the name of *Christ*, they were yet *believing* disciples ; and their faith was "the gift of God" by the Spirit. Eph. 2 : 8.

It may, however, be a matter of surprise with some, that these disciples, if really, and by the grace of the Spirit, *believers* before their Christian baptism, should yet declare that they "had not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." This translation evidently needs further remark. Let us endeavor to understand it.

The history of these twelve disciples, then, so far as it is connected with this transaction, is, briefly but evidently, this. Soon after receiving from John that baptism, which, we are told, required repentance and faith in Christ, as then about to appear in His Messianic character, they had emigrated from Judea to Ephesus, in a distant part of the Lesser Asia ; and there engaged in the pursuit of some of those callings, peculiar to the Jews of the dispersion. In that remote seclusion, and amid their engrossing traffic, though true believers in Christ, yet they had never, until this meeting with Paul, heard whether the Holy Ghost, in His promised marvelous effusion, had, as yet, come upon His followers.

That this is the true import of their language will, upon reflection, become sufficiently manifest. It cannot, by any but a superficial reader, be supposed, that they, who had been baptized by John, the inspired herald of Christ, had literally never heard of the existence of the Holy Ghost. What?

Persons, who were themselves Jews, who were acquainted with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in all their promises both of the Messiah and of the Spirit; and yet actually ignorant of the existence of that Spirit?—Was not John, their great master, who taught, as well as baptized them, himself at length a partaker of the Holy Ghost in His *fulness* both of ordinary and extraordinary gifts? And being so, would he tell his pupils nothing of that Divine Inspirer? Was it not his wont, as Jesus passed by at the opening of His ministry, not only to point to Him with this very finger of the Gospel, “Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world,” John, 1 : 29 : but also to say to his disciples : “I, indeed, baptize you with *water* unto *repentance*; but He shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost*, and with *fire*?” Matt. 3 : 11. See also John, 1 : 32, 33. Is not this language of John an admitted prophecy, concurrent with that of Joel, of the Pentecostal wonder; and had not this very language, in all probability, led these very disciples to look out for something like what then happened? Is not this specimen of John’s teaching the foundation of what Paul said to these disciples at Ephesus : “John verily baptized with the baptism of *repentance*, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him, who should come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ?” Acts, 19 : 4. And is it possible, after this

view of John's manner of teaching, to suppose that these disciples, even though of late far removed from Judea, had literally never before heard of the Holy Ghost? No. Nor do their words, rightly rendered, import any such thing. In meaning, their words are similar to those of the other John in his Gospel, when interpreting the language of Christ about "Rivers of living Water." "This," says John, "spake He of *the Spirit*, which they that believe on Him should receive : for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." John, 7 : 39. In this passage, as it stands in our translation, the word, "given," is an addition. It is not in the original. Literally, the words are : "The Holy Ghost was not yet." Nor are the two passages similar in meaning only ; but, so far as the point of comparison goes, in phraseology also. With the simple difference between a past and a present tense, the words to be compared are the same. Literally rendered, the phrase in the Gospel is ; "for, not yet *the Holy Ghost was* : " οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον : while that in the passage before us stands thus : "whether *the Holy Ghost is* : " εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔστιν. And the true force of the passages is this. In his Gospel, the Evangelist says : "as yet, the Holy Ghost was not : " historically interpreted, "was not yet *given*," not yet Pentecostally poured forth in His miraculous fulness

to glorify Christ. In the dialogue at Ephesus, the disciples of the Baptist say : " we have not heard whether the Holy Ghost is : " historically interpreted, " we have not heard whether, in His promised gifts of miraculous power, the Spirit has yet been shed forth upon the Church."

It is not true, then, that these disciples knew not of the existence of the Holy Ghost. However imperfectly, they were still really, the subjects of His renewing grace. Under the Baptist's teachings, the Spirit had made them *believing* disciples, with that repentance and faith in a coming Christ, which, as we have seen, their master taught ; but ever since they left his early ministry, they had been far away at Ephesus, and so, had never enjoyed an opportunity of being baptized in the name of Christ ; nor even heard of that glorious effusion of the Holy Spirit, which had taken place at the Pentecost ; much less, been made sharers in its wonders. Not John, who first baptized them, but Jesus, in whose name they were now baptized, gave forth the marvels of that awful Day, and " was glorified " in them : not their first, therefore, but their second baptism was followed by their being made sharers in its rich and special gifts. Such, manifestly, is the true force of the passage ; and thus understood, it is one of those, which shew that, at first, the phrases, " gift of the

Holy Ghost,"—"The Holy Ghost came,"—"The Holy Ghost fell, &c." were used to designate His strictly extraordinary endowments in miracle and Inspiration. The conclusion, therefore, remains undisturbed, that, in the case of these disciples at Ephesus, the ordinary gift was *before*, and the extraordinary, *after* Baptism.

With the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, however, my present argument has no concern. It is busied wholly with His ordinary grace; that, by which He renews and sanctifies the Soul, and makes it a temple of the indwelling God as the common privilege of His Spiritual children. This, as we have seen, in one of the foregoing remarks, is, by none of the strong passages first cited, connected with Baptism; while, as we have seen in the other of those remarks, numerous equally strong passages either impliedly or expressly disconnect it from Baptism. The urgent inference, thus far, would be that, so far as we take the Bible for our authority, we have no reason for saying, or supposing, that it is ever connected with Baptism.

4. Having thus shewn that all these passages have no connection, or rather no such connection as is claimed, with the subject of Baptism, let us now at last proceed to inquire into the true meaning of those passages, which I have cited, and which speak of that indwelling of God, Father, Son and

Spirit, which comes by the grace, or gift of the Holy Ghost.

(1.) I observe, then, first, they all speak of this indwelling gift, without saying anything of the mode, or means, by which the gift is bestowed, and the indwelling realized. To illustrate this, therefore, I must bring in another class of texts, which throw on this point all the light that can be had. This is a legitimate resort: for even indirect statements of truth, if really explanatory of other statements, are as valuable for proof as the direct statements which they explain.

(a.) The Apostle Paul, then, speaks of "the new man" as "renewed *in knowledge*, after the Image of Him that created him." Col. 3 : 10. Here "the new man," or the soul "renewed after the Image of God," is the result; renewal, the process; the Holy Ghost, the implied agent; and "*knowledge*," the *means* used in that process. It is true that the words, rendered, "*in knowledge*," might be rendered, "*unto knowledge*;" making knowledge one of the results of renewal. But it is also true that they may be rendered "*by knowledge*," making knowledge the *means* used; and this rendering is confirmed by what the same Apostle says elsewhere of the same process:—"In Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the Gospel." 1 Cor. 4 : 15. In this expression are summarily involved the

same points ; the new man ; his renewal, or new-birth ; the implied agency of the Holy Spirit ; and the *means* used, "*the Gospel*," spiritual "*knowledge*." And this unfolds the whole work before us. The gift of the Spirit, resulting in that "new man," wherein dwelleth God, whether as the Father, or as the Son, or as the Holy Ghost, is communicated through, or by, the Gospel ; by means of knowledge, or Divine Truth. This point, then, would seem free from doubt. The "new man," or new life, claimed as the gift of the Spirit in Baptism alone, is the result of His work through the preaching of the Gospel, or some equivalent use of heavenly Truth.

(b.) Even an Old Testament Prophet took this view. Says Jeremiah, speaking of the "new covenant," or gracious relation between God and His people, and uttering the very words of God : "I will put my *Law* in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts ; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Jer. 31 : 33. This relation between God and His people is identical with His dwelling in them, as the gift of His Spirit ; and He produces this relation by "putting His *Law* in their inward parts, and writing it in their hearts." This *Law* here means a *knowledge* of God and His will, the *spirit* of the *Law* transferred to the inner man. This "writing it in the heart" is the work of the Holy Ghost, giving inward effect to the

Truth ; and the resulting relation between God and His people is all they need or can have of Him, save the sacred peace, the holy delight, the divine communings which follow on that relation.

(c.) A part of this subject, the Agent and the process of our renewal, is strikingly set forth by the Apostle to the Corinthians. "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same Image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. 3 : 18. What is "the glory of the Lord," here said to be mirrored to our "open face," or unveiled mind? If we look back upon the Apostle's discourse, we shall find it to be His *revealed* glory, the glory which had its symbol in the shining face of Moses ; the glory of the Divine Character and Truth, as it finally shone out "in the face of Jesus Christ," or in His person, character and teachings. The Jews, when Moses and the Old Testament were read, saw not this glory. "Their minds were blinded." "The veil was upon their hearts ;" the veil, in part, of their own prejudices, and, in part, of the typical and shadowing character of their Law and Dispensation. But, "in Christ, this Veil is done away." By His coming, especially when He comes into the heart of the *believer*, the perversions of Jewish prejudice are swept away, and light is poured on the sacred page. Now, therefore, we

can look into the Mirror of the Word "with open face," that is, without a veil ; and, "beholding there the glory of the Lord," especially as it is reflected "in the face of Jesus Christ," His Person and His Truth. "we are *changed* into the same Image from glory to glory" by the enlightening and quickening power of His Spirit. Here we have the whole gift of the Holy Ghost ; *changing* our sinful natures into the renewed "Image" of God, through that Truth, living in Jesus, and shining in His Word, in which His best glories are mirrored to our view ; "the light of the *knowledge* of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," shining "in our hearts," and making us truly "light in the Lord."

(d.) By one of the most persuasive arguments ever urged, our Saviour teaches us, that the Gift of the Spirit is to be sought and obtained in *prayer*. "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him ?" Luke, 11 : 13. But prayer for the Spirit implies a *knowledge* of God and of His way of salvation ; in opening which and leading us along that way the Spirit is concerned. Prayer for the Spirit is the sighing of a heart feeling after a God *revealed* ; not the asking of a mind groping for a God *unknown*. "The sacrifice of the wicked, indeed, is an abomination to the Lord : " yet,

though prayer for the gift of the Spirit most frequently ascends from hearts already renewed by His grace and longing after fuller measures of His indwelling, it must be admitted that, when God, by His word or Providence, has set the as yet unchanged heart to longing for Himself, the utterance of its longing, though in a silent sigh, will draw down the gift of the Spirit, if not in its fulness, at least in its sufficiency, even though no outward rite be witness to the prayer. Prayer, uttered alone, and in the silence of the Soul, has as much the promise of the Gift, as prayer offered with the multitude and amid the voices of the Temple.

(e.) It is the teaching of the same Saviour that the "*manifestation*" of Himself to the believer, and His "*indwelling*" with Him are identical in meaning ; and that this high favor is vouchsafed to the heart of *Love*, that knows and obeys the truth. "Lord, how is it that Thou wilt *manifest* Thyself unto us, and not unto the world ? Jesus answered, if a man *love* me, he will *keep my words*, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our *abode* with him." John, 14 : 22, 23. Here is an inquiry into the *mode* of the Divine manifestation, or indwelling ; and the answer to the querist's How ? is, that the mystery hath just this depth, no more nor other than mutual *love* between God and the Christian, expressed in a

keeping of the words of Christ, or in obedience to His truth. He who keeps his Saviour's words because he *loves* the Saviour, shall know that he in turn *is loved* of the Father ; while, in the secret of this *mutual love*, and in the path of this intelligent obedience, he shall realize that both the Father and the Son are *with him* of a truth, *dwelling* in him, and *manifesting* themselves to him, as they do not unto the world. This passage not only explains the *mode* of the Divine manifestation, but still further intimates in what this manifestation itself consists ; in *mutual love*, and the *evidence*, which this love and its fruits furnish, of that gracious and happy relation, which subsists between God and the true Christian ; a relation, sealed in Christ and witnessed by the Spirit, wherever the heart, in the exercise of true repentance and a living faith, yields itself to God, though it be but in its first secret consentings to His blessed covenant of life ; and this inward sealing and witnessing would doubtless stand good forever, though its subject were never to enjoy the desired opportunity of publicly embodying that covenant in the appropriate solemnities of visible sign and seal.

(f.) The great Apostle to the Gentiles spreads out this whole subject in still more ample expression. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by *His Spirit* in the inner man ; that Christ may *dwell in your hearts by faith* ; that ye, being rooted and grounded *in love*, may be able to comprehend with *all Saints* what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height ; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge ; that ye might be *filled with all the fulness of God*.” Eph. 3 : 14–19.

This passage gathers all the particulars of our subject into a single sentence. Here is the great “Gift of the Spirit,” in all its depth and power, working “according to the riches of God’s glory in the *inner man* ;” here, too, is “Christ *dwelling in the heart* ;” here, in short, is the believer “*filled with all the fulness of God* ;” and all this, in less or greater measure, the common privilege of “*all Saints* ;” of “the whole family in heaven and earth ;” of all the children of God, who have gone from the olden Dispensation, as well as of those who are gathering into that upper home from the new.* This, then, is not the extraordinary gift of

* Mr. Newman holds that there is a great difference between the Old and the New Testament Saints in regard to what is conveyed in this gift of the Spirit ; that the latter *have* what this Gift conveys, while the former *had it not*. “Whatever they were,” he says, “however high in God’s favor, how-

the Holy Ghost, of which so much has been said, but His ordinary grace ; the common privilege of all God's faithful people. It is, therefore, in the strictest sense, pertinent to the subject of our present inquiry.

Does this passage, then, say aught of the means, by which this gift is obtained ; or of the medium, through which it is received ; or of the exercises, in which it is realized and enjoyed ? Certainly it does ; but *what* does it say ? Does it say that this gift is a supernatural investment of and from God, over and above nature ? Does it say that this gift is neither renovation, nor any of its fruits, but a mysterious endowment distinct from them, superior to them, and inclusive of them all ? And

ever influenced by God's secret aids, they could not be partakers of that, which did not as yet exist, the Body and Blood of the Incarnate Son." He allows that they had a sort of piety, " the fruit, too, of Divine assistance ;" still, it was " but the poor effort after that righteousness, which it never could really reach, and which He" (Christ) " is. Its services . . did not tend to the perfection, which they testified. . . . They could not rise out of their feeble selves and claim to be His works, not man's."

He puts a corresponding difference between Jewish and Christian Sacraments. " The Church, before His coming, offered to Him material elements, ' which perish in the using ;' but now He has sent *His Spirit* to fill them with *Himself*, and to make them living and *availing* sacrifices to the Father, &c." Lect. on Justification, pp. 225 and 226.

And if the gift of the Spirit be what Mr. N. teaches, and if its impartations be what he would have us believe, he is right in his theology on this point ; but if not, he is, while seeming to recognize some admitted and important truths, perniciously wrong in the system which he constructs upon those truths.

does it say that this gift is miraculously communicated in baptism and as miraculously increased in the Eucharist?—No—not a word of all this, nor of aught cognate with it in Theology. It speaks, indeed, of inward strengthenings of the Spirit, of the indwelling of Christ, and of the Saints filled with all the *fulness* of the Father ; and all this is certainly something which nature itself can never give us ; but, then, this great gift is sought in answer to *prayer* ; when it comes, it is received by *faith* ; and when realized, it is enjoyed by that holy *love*, which delights to comprehend what it may of the breadth and length and depth and height of that Love wherewith Christ hath loved us, however at present this Love may overpass our power of knowledge. In all this, too, we have simply “the new man,” in the recovered “Image of God,” putting forth his renovated powers in faith, comprehension, knowledge and love, in the pleasing effort to realize the manifested love, and presence and inworking of God, his Father, his Saviour and his Sanctifier. It is simply renovation and its fruits ; carried out, indeed, to a fulness not often attained ; still, simply renovation and its fruits ; God, in all His persons, and imitable perfections, dwelling in the heart by *faith* ; and this faith proving itself “the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen ;” and bringing into

manifestation, before the mind, the Spirit with all the bright but, to sense, viewless realities of the Spiritual world.

This high gift of the Spirit, and all the treasures which it brings, may doubtless be most richly enjoyed in the services of God's house, especially in that sacred act, in which Christians commune and covenant together with their bodily absent, though spiritually present Saviour, over the consecrated symbols of His body and his blood, His Death and His passion ; and yet, it is a gift, which, with all its peculiar treasures, may come *before* any outward Sacrament, and which may abide with the Christian, strengtheningly and satisfyingly, though all outward rites be denied him.

(2.) This course of illustration from particular passages might be indefinitely extended ; but it can hardly be considered necessary to pursue the illustration any farther. I pass, therefore, to what this somewhat prolonged examination of texts and classes of texts has, from the first, held in view ; the question : What is this gift of the Spirit, and what is meant by that indwelling of God, Father, Son and Spirit, in the hearts of His people, which this gift enables them to realize ?

Is it, as some claim, an actual impartation of and from God ; that is, the actual Spiritual substance, the very Divine nature itself, especially of the In-

carnate Son, miraculously communicated and mysteriously lodged within us, yet no part of us ; added to our nature, shining from and around the heart, and perhaps, at last, tending to absorb the human nature into the Divine?—Evidently, nothing is farther than this from the teaching of the Word of God, even in those, the strongest of its expressions, which I at first quoted, and to prepare for the true sense of which I have passed through so long a series of remarks. The true sense of those passages has already been partially unfolded in what has been said. It may, however, be well to give it a fuller statement.

The Gift of the Spirit, then, in His ordinary grace, and in the consequent indwelling of God with His people, consists in and includes, first, the mission of the Holy Ghost, from the Father and the Son, upon the heavenly work of “convincing the world of sin, of righteousness and of Judgment ;” particularly, of “taking” the things of Christ, “*shewing them to*” His disciples, and thereby “glorifying” Him in their salvation ; in regenerating and sanctifying their rational and moral nature through the truth, as taught in the Word, or as made manifest in the Soul ; and second, that sacred and happy fellowship, which ensues between the regenerate and sanctified soul, and that God who has thus graciously regenerated

and sanctified it. This work of glorifying Christ in the salvation of the sinner involves the enactment of the covenant of grace between God and the Soul ; and this enactment takes place amid those withdrawn scenes, in that silence and secrecy of the thoughts, where the Reconciler and the reconciled have their first meeting of peace. No eye but the inner one of the penitent and the approving one of the Omniscient looks upon it, or knows aught of it, until it comes out in the light of a holy life, the beneficence of godly actions ; or until it is brought forth for sealing and witnessing in the face of the Church and under the seals of her Sacraments. And then, the indwelling of God, which follows this secret covenanting, is the "fellowship" of the regenerate soul "with the Father, with His Son Jesus Christ, and with the Holy Spirit ;" 1 John, 1 : 3 ; 2 Cor. 13 : 14 ; a fellowship maintained through *faith*, enjoyed in *love*, and perfected with the growing perfection of the divine likeness within. This indwelling is the direct opposite to that state of the wicked, which the Psalmist describes, when he says : "God is not in all his thoughts." Ps. 10 : 4. God *is* in all the thoughts of His regenerate child ; so far at least as the lingering conflict with sin allows him to act according to the tendencies of his renewed mind. In these thoughts, he delights to hold converse with

God, especially as manifested amid the wonders of His Redemption in Christ Jesus. In this holy and blessed fellowship, his *faith* lifts its eye and realizes the presence of his Redeemer, and his Sanctifier : his *Love* opens its heart and takes in all that it can of the incomprehensible love of Christ for him : his *hope* goes up and grasps all that it may of the fulness of God as his eternal portion : his *thoughts* range through the vastness of their theme, and bring home growing knowledge of the infinitely perfect and blessed ONE : and thus, under the teachings of the Spirit through the truth, and most rapidly when privileged to walk in the way of God's appointments in His Church, his whole soul becomes more and more full of God, of a recovered likeness to Him, of blessed thoughts of Him, and of a divine enjoyment of Him.

To run over, now, and give the force of the quoted texts : "The High and lofty One dwells with him who is of a contrite and humble spirit ;" and the effect of His dwelling there is—"to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite one ;" by His sweet influences the lowly to exalt and the bruised to heal. True Christians are His "temples ;" and He "dwells in them and walks in them." They have worshiping and adoring thoughts of Him, and keep up in their hearts sacrifices of prayer and praise, which render

their souls fitter temples to Him than even His awful palace in the olden Church. And then, His "exceeding great and precious promises," received by faith, make them "partakers of the divine nature;"—not indeed of the essence of God, *the* Divine nature itself, but—of a divine nature, *θείας φύσεως*, without the article; a nature *like* God's, the Divine *likeness* recovered.

Especially, Christ "abideth in them." This precious Saviour "dwells in their hearts by *faith*." By faith, their hearts sweetly entertain this friend and brother of their souls. By faith, they "put on Christ," with all the effects of believing, until they stand "conformed to His Image," dressed both in a robe of righteousness which He has externally wrought *for* them, and in a garment of holiness, which they have inwardly caught from His shining graces. He is *in them*, the hope of glory. Their inmost thoughts, affections and desires do so lovingly centre in Him, and so embracingly cluster round Him, that they cannot doubt of ultimately sharing with Him the glory to which He is already exalted. He is "formed in them," in the growingly beautiful likeness, which they bear to Him; in that Image of Himself within them, which He sees gradually shaping and brightening towards perfection; and in the growth of which He anticipates, with a fulness of divine satisfaction, the time when

they will be "presented faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy."

As the Source and Agent of all these gracious blessings, they have also received "the Spirit," which Christ promised. This Divine Quickener, clothing himself in the light and making himself the power of revealed or otherwise manifested Truth, has made them "new creatures in Christ Jesus," and brought them to that spiritual mind, in which such inward visions of God are possible, and such satisfying fellowship with God not only possible, but actual. He has made even their "*bodies* His temples;" their thoughts of Him and their communings with Him, bring Him within the walls of this lowly tabernacle, the flesh, by putting all bodily appetites, affections and faculties under His sacred control, and making them all instruments of His heavenly work. In short, both in soul and in body, they know what it is, in this, its true sense, to be "*filled with the Spirit.*"

Such, in the sober light of the Scriptures, are that Gift of the Spirit, and that indwelling of God in the hearts of His people, about which we have been inquiring. This, in its fulness, is all that we need to make us *holy*; all that we need to make us *happy*; and all that we can have to make us *glorious*.

To advert, then, to the suggestion, which has

given rise to what has been said in this Chapter, it appears, from the texts and classes of texts, which have been examined, that, whatever may be meant by the terms, principle, seed, or germ of the new life, the Bible furnishes no ground for supposing that any such thing is implanted in the Infant at Baptism, or at any other period ; the inference, to which we are led, is, rather, that our regeneration, as to its origin and instrument, conforms to the ordinary work of the Spirit in enlightening, quickening and sanctifying the children of God by faith and through the truth. This change, so far as it is knowable, has its beginning in that "repentance and faith," which "infants, by reason of their tender age, cannot perform." The Theory, which lays the beginning of this work in Baptism, whether infant or adult, puts the Bible out of its true place. It tends to substitute, for the great office of the Bible in the hands of the Spirit, a supposed efficacy of Sacraments, whose inevitable fruits are, growing error in doctrine and growing superstition in practice. The Theorists, on this point, repeatedly speak of Baptism as a "miracle," and of both the Sacraments as partaking of the miraculous in their effects. If, then, the new life, or its germ, may be miraculously communicated by one Sacrament to unconscious, or unintelligent Infancy, it may of course be miraculously developed by

another Sacrament in unreflecting and even unbelieving manhood. And thus the office of the Scriptures of Truth is practically superceded. The ministry need not preach those Scriptures ; nor need the people search them ; the former to teach, nor the latter to learn, how they " testify of Christ." The work of both parties is practically summed up in Sacraments ; and their spiritual life is understood as both given and nourished in those supposed awfully efficient mysteries. It is needless to say that this disuse of the Scriptures and of Scriptural preaching, and this solitary magnifying of the Sacraments are facts, with which the history of the Church has been but too widely and too sadly familiar.

How utterly unlike this System and its fruits is that which stands out, unconcealable, on the pages of Inspiration ! "The Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4 : 12. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." . . . "The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." Ps. 19 : 7, 8. "Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law." Ps. 119 : 18. "Sanctify them through Thy Truth : Thy Word is

Truth." John, 17 : 17. How all these and a thousand similar texts exalt the Bible !

Indeed, for what purpose was this sacred volume inspired and sent, but to be a moral *light*, in which the Holy Spirit may come, and manifest Himself and make all other spiritual realities manifest to our minds ? an *atmosphere* of Truth, in which He may become spiritually discernible, and with which He may breathe on the conscious and intelligent soul, as it lies diseased and defiled in its sins, His quickening and purifying power ? It is no more evident that, without natural light, we should see no natural objects, than it is, that, without this spiritual light, we should have no perception of spiritual objects ; and so, should remain unaffected by the realities of the spiritual world. Of this body of spiritual light we have special need ; for if we have it not before the people, spread over our ecclesiastical firmament in *divine* writings, we shall certainly have a substitute for it before their eyes, glooming through the vague expanse of unwritten Tradition. But, in this latter form, the light is filled and darkened by so many clouds, and the atmosphere is pervaded and poisoned by so many miasms, that God, foreseeing what would happen, gave us heavenly Light and air in the form of His own fixed, incorruptible and lively Truth. To this, therefore, we must go for the only light in

which we can clearly see spiritual things, and for the only atmosphere in which we can freely breathe spiritual life. It is only through the light of His holy Word that God “shines in our hearts,” and gives us—not His actual *substance*, in the person of His Incarnate Son, but—“the light of the *knowledge* of His own glory in the face of Jesus Christ.” And so, beholding this glory as in a glass, “we are”—not supernaturally endowed with an addition from His nature to our own, but—“changed into the same Image,” a *likeness* to Himself; and this gracious change, by His continual shining and our continual beholding, is carried on, “from glory to glory,” in the ever-brightening resemblance, “as by the Spirit of the Lord.”

CHAPTER III.

CONSIDERATION OF SUGGESTIONS CONTINUED.

A SECOND suggestion, which may be started by the views, exhibited in the First Chapter, is this: Did not God, at first, without any intermediate means, *create* the soul in holiness, or in His own Image; and can He not now *new-create* it unto holiness, or His recovered Image, without the particular intermediate means of Divine Truth? And if so, though this new creation be not by the water of Baptism, as its instrument, yet may it not be at Baptism as its time, and in the Infant as its subject?

In discussing the topic, which this suggestion brings before us, it must be remembered that I am not about to inquire what is, abstractly, either possible, or impossible with God, but that I am inquiring whether we have any reason to suppose that the new life, even if such a gift be thus possible with God, is, as an actual fact, imparted to the Infant at Baptism? In considering the previous

suggestion, some little time was spent in clearing the way by setting aside those loose interpretations of Scripture, which stand, like buttresses, around the edifice of an imposing, but, as we regard it, a false System of Theology. In like manner, a discussion of the topic presented by this second suggestion, will call for some time, though I hope not too much, in order to shew that it is one thing to ask whether a Baptismal miracle upon Infancy be not possible with God ; and another thing to shew that this miracle is actually wrought in every, or in any, case of duly administered Infant Baptism. While loose interpretations of Scripture may buttress a false System of Theology, a philosophical query may perform the same office for a modification of that system ; and it may be as important to show the inconclusiveness of this philosophical query as it was to set aside those loose interpretations of Scripture.

1. It is unfortunate, then, for the argument, intended to be involved in this second suggestion, that the conclusion, which it seeks, does not follow from the premises, with which it starts. To *create* a soul, *originally*, and to *new-create* a *sinful* Soul, are very different processes. In what the former consists we know not. To us, the original creation of a Soul is in all respects unfathomable. We may, indeed, rationally decide in what it does not consist.

It does not consist in imparting a portion of the Divine essence either to an angelic form or to a human body ; for then this portion might, at His pleasure, be reabsorbed into God ; become what, in truth, it had never ceased to be, identical with Him ; and thus leave God again the solitary intelligence, the only rational being in the Universe. This would be but the emanative Philosophy of the Heathen ; the old Oriental Pantheism. As believers in the Bible, then, we may go so far as to say that the original creation of the soul consisted in no such act as that here supposed. In what this act really consisted we are, and must remain, profoundly ignorant. Its unsearchable Author alone can penetrate and comprehend the process. But, in what the act of *new-creating* the soul of sinful man consists we at least partially know. In all respects, it is true, we cannot comprehend even this act. In the movements of the regenerating Spirit, the heavenly "Wind bloweth where it listeth : and we cannot tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth." Nevertheless, we can "hear the sound thereof ;" we can perceive its direction and its effects ; we can comprehend something of the process carried on in our inner man ; and we can understand all the results of this in our own renewed character. In some respects, therefore, we know in what the new-creating act consists.

We know this, at least, that it is a totally different act from that of original creation. It is true that the Apostle calls it "a new creation;" Gal. 6:15; and there are great beauty and force in the figure: still it is a figure; and though, like all other Scriptural figures, heavy with deep and important meaning, yet a figure, and not literal language. The process described is a moral, not a physical; an alterative, not an originating act. It consists, not in originating a soul into separate nature and life, but in actuating the nature of a living soul already originated and become sinful; in so actuating it as to effect its restoration from sin; a change of its character, in its tempers and tastes, its inclinations and purposes, its inward and its outward habits and actions. And this is a process, which we can, in a measure, comprehend. How God begins and sustains it we know not; but how it is begun and sustained in us we know, at least so far as it begins and is sustained in memory and reflection, conscience and will, thought and feeling, purpose and action, in the great work of repentance and faith, love and obedience. Creation, as affecting *man*, consists in originating a soul, with the power, or faculty of remembering and reflecting, judging and willing, thinking and feeling, purposing and acting. The new creation consists in putting this soul, after it has become disordered and dis-

eased by sin, into restored appropriate and healthful activities. Of the former process we can know nothing. Of the latter we may know much.

The two processes, then, being thus dissimilar, it by no means follows that, because God, at first, created the soul in holiness, without any intermediate means, therefore He can new-create a sinful soul unto holiness, without some intermediate means. In the former act *one* will only was concerned: in the latter, *two* wills, that of God and that of man, are concerned; and it may be that, when the one will of the Creator originated a second will in His creature, He thereby divinely ordained a constitution, under which a change of the second will cannot be wrought by the first without a *concurrence of the two*; or, that it is as impossible to regenerate a sinner *without* the concurrence of his will as it is to regenerate him *against* the consent of his will.—I say, this *may be* so. It is not necessary to demonstrate that it actually *is* so. It is enough to say that it may be so, by God's own ordination. And if He has constituted a nature, which, after becoming voluntarily sinful, cannot be regenerated unto holiness without the concurrence of its own will, then also it may be, that this regeneration cannot be wrought without some intermediate means. And if, by God's own ordination, some intermediate means of Regenera-

tion are rendered necessary, then, why should not the particular means of His own Divine Truth be that intermediate necessity? Facts look as if this were really so; as if, since the fall, God had given us, more and more fully, His own Truth, and more and more adequately His ministry for preaching that Truth, because He has Himself made that Truth necessary in doing within us His own saving work.

I say not, that under the supposed Divine constitution of things, God could not regenerate a sinful soul without *the Bible*. That would be deciding, more positively than a reasonable man would dare to decide, the case of those innumerable multitudes, who have never had, and those countless myriads who now have not the Bible. What I suggest is, the possibility that God cannot, under the constitution, which He has Himself ordained for man, regenerate a sinful soul without the intermediate means of such truth as the Bible *contains*, made known in such a way as He may be pleased to appoint. By a special communication, He may present such truth to any one capable of appreciating it; and thus, without the *written* form of that truth, may regenerate that soul, "through knowledge, after the Image of Him that created him." This, however, makes nothing for the advocates of this modified Baptismal regeneration; for

they pretend to no such special communication of Truth. Infants in Baptism could not appreciate it. It does, however, make something in favor of what I have advanced. Every man, if he have not this truth by a revelation special to himself, giving him a knowledge of God and of Spiritual things, and making him through the Spirit a participant in the new life of the soul, may, according to the view here taken, be under a Divinely ordained necessity of having this Truth, as already revealed in the Bible ; either perused by himself, or in some way proclaimed in his hearing, or brought home to his mind : and for this purpose, that truth may have been providentially made accessible to him.

Before the fall, God talked with man face to face : but since that catastrophe, though He can do, and sometimes has done, the same thing, yet He is ordinarily withdrawn from such familiarity of intercourse. The awful privilege befits not a race of defiled and condemned transgressors. Still, as a token of His yet living mercy, yea, as a means by which that mercy may reach us in our ruin, He has graciously left us a substitute for that high fellowship by communicating to us His *written* Truth, full of the knowledge of Himself and of heavenly things, and divinely fitted both for use by His Spirit, and for entrance into our minds. And now, without this truth, addressed to our reason and understand-

ing, to our conscience and will, and flooding the world with a knowledge of Himself and of divine things, it may be of His own ordaining that He can not reach the soul with regenerating and saving grace. At least, to say that He can, is to say that He may save the heathen without sending them the Bible, or any equivalent for it in special inward teaching. It is as much as to say that He can save full grown men while they lie in perfect ignorance of Himself and of all spiritual relation to Himself. This is a high theme ; and it behoves us to touch it reverently. Is it, then, presumption to say that God, by His own ordaining, may be self-bound to His own Truth, actually made known, understood and felt, as a means in the hand of His Spirit, of quickening a sinful soul to the new and spiritual life? Is it presumption to say that, as Sin first entered by man's volition, so it may have been ordained that Sin can never be taken away without man's consent? That it *may* be taken away, or that the work of taking it away may be begun, in *involuntary* Infancy, is but a speculative supposition. It rests on no Scriptural proof. We meet one supposition with another ; and, by exhibiting the radical difference between a literal *original* creation, and a figurative though real *new-creation*, we think that the rebutting supposal is shewn to be the better of the two.

2. The conclusion, that, in the new-creating process, the intermediate means of Truth may have become a Divinely ordained necessity, may, peradventure, be strengthened by shewing that the supposed use of such intermediate means would, after all, but leave the new-creating process in analogy with all that we can know of intercourse in the Spiritual world.

We have no evidence, then, from either reason or revelation, that spirit ever affects spirit by what we may term a direct impact of their essences, that it is by any such touches that they stir the powers, modify the character, or affect the nature of each other. They have another mode of action; and that mode, we know, involves the use of Truth in some of its forms. I speak of good spirits. To evil spirits *error* stands in the place of Truth. We know that the Holy Spirit, so far as it uses *revealed* Truth, can reach our souls, while in the body, only through the senses of seeing and hearing. If the body be laid aside, or, what amounts to the same thing, be not *used* in the intercourse, the Holy Spirit, in the use of Truth, reaches the soul through its *inward* senses, its *inner* seeing and hearing. I say, "in the use of Truth;" for Truth exists independently of the body, independently of even recorded Revelation; and God uses it in holding intercourse with disembodied spirits; and He uses

it by presenting it to the inner senses, the seeing and hearing, of the soul, those spiritual senses, without which Truth were valueless in the world of spirits. Hence the Bible represents God as speaking and listening to angels ; while they, in their turn, speak and listen to Him ; or, again, speak and listen to one another. Nor is this mere empty imagery. It represents spiritual *facts* ; and it carries silent proof that fleshless spirits, like God and angels, and our own unbodied souls, have inward, spiritual senses, in the use of which they communicate and receive knowledge, or Truth. This knowledge and those inner senses, Truth known and made known, are grand media of happy and beneficial intercourse between all pure spirits.

The same thing held true, when the body, though not laid aside, was yet unused, in the intercourse of all those Revelations, in which there was no vision to the outward eye, and no voice to the outward ear. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And how were they moved ? Was there a mere sensible impulse, stirring the body, and leaving them to speak whatever might come up amid the fervors of the unusual excitement ? Not so. The Spirit doubtless moved them by suggesting thoughts pregnant with the Truth to be known ; that those thoughts might be

uttered for present use and recorded for permanent study ; in other words, by Truth and the sense which received it ;—by Truth known and made known, through that receptive faculty, without which there could have been no revealing intercourse between God and man.

Here, then, is the great, established mode of intercommunication between spiritual beings ; and it is a mode, which apparently meets all their wants and all their capabilities. With Truth, understood and felt ; with Truth, as a light shining every where around them, all possible objects and influences become perceptible and influential ; while, without Truth, all would be the darkness, and motionlessness, and powerlessness of the Spiritual world. If there could be a spirit without Truth, or without the faculty of receiving truth, it would evidently be cut off from all happy and profitable intercourse with other spirits, whether its superiors or its equals. But there are no such spirits. Mutual interchange of thought and truth, with the feelings, sympathies and acts, which follow in the exchange of such Divine wealth, constitutes the peculiar, established intercourse of the whole world of spirits ; and the mighty power, involved in the thoughts and truths, in the feelings and sympathies, which circulate in such an intercourse, constitute a necessary element, and *may* constitute the whole

body, of the influence which one good spirit exerts over another, or which one good spirit exerts over another that is evil.

If, then, when man, by his own will, brought in sin, God ordained a supposed possible constitution, under which sin cannot be taken away without the *consent* of man's will, and the use of Truth as an intermediate means of conviction, this, after all, was but leaving the work of regeneration, or of new-creating the soul unto holiness, in analogy with all that we can know of the intercourse of the world of spirits. That intercourse, so far as it is revealed in the Bible and in reason, is carried on, and all its benign results wrought out, amid the potencies of Truth.

3. Another question on this point may, indeed, arise. *One* mode of communication, or intercourse, between spirits has been pointed out : may there not be *some other* mode, involving neither a direct impact of spirit upon spirit, nor the use of Truth as a *medium* of intercourse ; and yet sufficient for the new-creation of a sinful soul unto holiness, or spiritual life ?

To this inquiry, however, a brief answer will be sufficient. First, then ; there is a strong, moral probability, from what has been said, that all the feelings and sympathies, and all the consequent influences with each other, which can arise in a

right intercourse of spirits, have and must have their ground in some of the numberless forms, combinations and relations of Truth; of Truth, perceived, understood and felt. Second; Truth, when used in spiritual intercourse, is addressed to the reason, the understanding, and the conscience. If, therefore, there be a possible intercourse of spirits, involving neither direct impact of their essences, nor the use of Truth as a medium, it must be one, in which reason, understanding and conscience remain without exercise; for Truth is the only thing that enters for good by these senses of the soul. It will be time to consider such an intercourse, when any one is found capable of conceiving its nature.

4. The suggestion, then, to which these remarks are addressed, must find its ultimate ground on what has been shewn to be a mere supposition,—that the new-creation of the soul unto holiness, or spiritual life, may be effected without any intercourse at all,—by direct impact of spirit upon spirit, and therefore at Baptism and upon involuntary Infancy; that God, in some unknown manner, may impress His simple essence upon the unconscious soul, enstamping it with His likeness as the seal leaves its imprint on the yielding wax, or quickening it into spiritual susceptibility as the dove broodingly awakens animation in the uncon-

scious egg. Something like this, it is urged, is necessary in the Regeneration of even the unbaptized adult. Of what use, it is asked, is light to the blind eye before it has received its sight? And of what use is Truth to the darkened mind before it has received a right inner vision? Does not the Spirit bring the light of Truth in vain upon innumerable souls; and is it not therefore necessary that, leaving this light, shining thus ineffectually in the outside vestibule of the soul, He should Himself enter in, impart the element of a new life, remove the native spiritual blindness of the mind, its perverting insensibility to Divine Truth, and thus render it favorably conscious of the light which is shining without, which shews the way of repentance and faith, and by which the Holy Spirit would excite it to enter that way intelligently and perseveringly? And, as this inner, this really regenerating work must be done in even the adult before Truth can be used in the further processes of Repentance and faith, may not the Spirit do this same inner regenerating work on the involuntary Infant at the time of its Baptism, leaving it to be developed in riper years by the use of Truth as a then effective means of operation? Is it unreasonable to suppose that this early regenerating gift may be imparted and yet lie latent in the soul until years of maturity? Are there not, in every Infant

mind, *dormant* native powers. which are never awakened until that infant has passed up amid the quickening experiences of life? And may not this early gift of the regenerating Spirit lie dormant too, until the baptized one has passed up amid the awakening educations of that Spirit in the future use of Divine Truth?

This questioning, I have said, rests on a supposition. It must be remembered, too, that I have not undertaken to shew that the supposition involves an absolute, or abstract impossibility on the part of God. I have, indeed, attempted to shew that it *may* involve, not an abstract, but a practical impossibility, under the constitution, which voluntary sin has brought upon man; and that it is legitimate to meet one supposition with another, if the latter be as fair as the former. But I will now take other ground, and proceed to look at this supposition from its own point of view. Suppose, then, that it is abstractly possible that this early inner work of regeneration may be done, at the time of its baptism, in the involuntary Infant;—have we any reason to believe that this abstract possibility is ever made an actual reality?

(1.) Have we any such reason from the teachings of the Bible?

As to *adult* regeneration, I have already,—see the first Chapter of the Introduction,—shewn that

the primary, inner secret of the work, or that, in which the perverting darkness, the obstructing deadness, of the soul to spiritual things, is removed, and the mind prepared for the efficacy of the Truth, may be, and doubtless is, wrought by the Holy Spirit through the same Truth, which He is to use in the further progress of His work; that, when He enters in, He does not leave the Truth shining ineffectually in the outer vestibule of the understanding, but takes that Truth in with Him, and makes it a vitally effective instrument of His work on the innermost man. To my mind, this is conclusively demonstrated by the language in Acts, 2 : 37, and in 1 Pet. 1 : 22, 23. In the former of these passages, which immediately follows Peter's first sermon, it is said: "When they heard, they were pricked in their heart." This was manifestly the first power of the Spirit within them. "They were *pricked*," not in the *fleshy* muscle called '*the heart*,' but in their *conscience* and moral *sensibilities*; and the piercing was through *the Truth* to which they were listening. "*When they heard*,"—*while* they were hearing,—"*they were pricked*." The Spirit made a "*Sword*" of the "*Word*," and with its point reached their innermost moral consciousness, and thus turned them, with all earnestness, to seek for salvation. "Men,—brethren, what *shall* we do?" In the latter of

these passages, they, who were addressed, are said to have "purified their souls in obeying *the Truth*, through *the Spirit*." Here, the regenerating work was evidently both *begun* and *continued* in the Spirit's use of *one* and the *same* means; and that means was "*the Truth*." It was the regenerating work in its *first motion*; for they who were its subjects are immediately said to have been "born again,"—regenerated,—"*by the Word of God*;" and it was that work *continued*; for its subjects are, at the same time, said to have advanced unto "*unfeigned love of the brethren*;" a divine mark of having "*passed* from death unto life." 1 John, 3 : 14.

So far, then, as the Bible is concerned, we need no further evidence that, in adults, the whole work of Regeneration, from its first inception to its final consummation, is wrought by the Spirit in the use of Divine Truth; that, by the Truth, the Spirit pierces the inner consciousness and will of the "dead in trespasses and sins," and thus takes away the insensibility and repugnance of the natural mind to divine things; and, by the same Truth, goes on to perfect His work in repentance and faith unto most "*unfeigned love of the brethren*," as an outflow from an already perfecting love for God Himself. No inference, therefore, from the actual regeneration of the adult can be carried to

the supposed regeneration of the Infant. If this work be ever wrought in infancy, it is as an exceptional process, and not as one that conforms to the rule of riper years. In every such case, there is an exceptional and prodigious miracle wrought on the unconscious and involuntary soul, while that soul is utterly ignorant of the existence of God, and utterly incapable of the removal of its ignorance.

And now, as to this alleged infant regeneration itself, as I have shown that it finds no scriptural analogy in the regeneration of the adult, so I hope to show, when I come to examine the texts, cited by the advocates of baptismal regeneration, that the teachings of the Bible furnish no evidence that this great miracle is ever wrought at, or in the Baptism of Infants. For this examination I am not quite ready ; and therefore, for the present, I press this point no further than to refer the reader forward to the next Chapter.

(2.) Assuming, for the present, that we have no evidence of this early regeneration in the teachings of the Bible, I ask, next, have we any evidence of it in the teachings of experience?

If this marvel be ever wrought in or at the Baptism of infants ; if this *dormant* element of the spiritual life, this *latent* right sensibility to spiritual things, this new *bias* in favor of truth and godliness, be ever imparted by, or during the adminis-

tration of that Sacrament to babes ; we may well ask, Why ? Why, unless to give, if not an infallible, at least a reasonable assurance that this *dormant* element will *awake*, that this *latent* sensibility will become *manifest*, that this new *bias* will begin to show its power, with the first opening of intelligence to the Truth and teachings of the Spirit ; that the baptized will show an early proclivity to the spiritual life, an early facility in taking in spiritual teachings and in bringing forth their proper fruits ? To say nothing of the impossibility of conceiving any analogy between dormant *native* powers, and a dormant spiritual *modification* of those powers, yet, supposing such modification abstractly possible, if it also become practically actual, must we not expect that dormant thing of life to *show* its life as soon as it becomes capable of the exhibition ? Does not a dormant love of music awake as soon as it hears music ? And ought not a dormant right sensibility to Divine Truth to awake as soon as it hears that Truth with an understanding ear ? Should not a latent proclivity to spiritual things come out as soon as it is capable of knowing spiritual things ? What is this dormant element of life, this latent bent or bias of the soul, if it awake not, if it open not, with the progress of appropriate excitement ?

What, then, says experience in reply to these

inquiries? Is this reasonable expectation justified by facts? Do baptized infants make their first voluntary movements, at the opening of religious intelligence and accountability, in the direction of the really new life of the spirit? The question is not, what is the ordinary effect of right, early religious instruction and example; but, in what direction does the character of baptized infants develop itself *independently* of such educational influences? Does it, as it were, instinctively, or in a way to show what is the newly-imparted bent or bias of the soul, develop itself in the direction which such educational influences ought to indicate? What answer does experience give to this question? I suppose it is hazarding nothing to say, that it gives an unhesitatingly *negative* reply; that baptized infants, like the unbaptized, develop in our day the unchanged, unmodified sinfulness of their nature just as soon, and just as unmistakably, as did the babes of men at the very infancy of the Race.

Or, put the question in another shape. Take two classes of Infants, say fifty in each; equally endowed by nature with sound minds in sound bodies; the one class baptized, and the other unbaptized; place them both under the same early social advantages, and under the same early religious training, from equally intelligent and faithful

Christian instructors; each class being equally guarded against the evil, and equally trained towards the good, of which they are capable; and then wait and watch for the result. Should we wait and watch for a greater number of early conversions, or of conversions at any age, from the former class than from the latter; or for the conversion of most of the former and but few of the latter? I should answer, unhesitatingly, no: experience teaches us that early conversions, as well as later conversions, are due, not to any marvel, supposed to be wrought in, or at, infant baptism, but to the power of the Holy Ghost through right religious training.

I conclude, then, that we have no reason, from either the Bible or experience, to believe that the mystery of regeneration, even if we concede its abstract possibility, is ever made an actual reality in, or at the time of, Infant Baptism. It is not, however, the mere mystery of the alleged gift that chiefly leads us to its rejection. No reasonable man will reject a doctrine merely because it involves a mystery. Many things are mysterious, yet true. If he reject it at all, he will reject this Theory of Baptismal regeneration because he finds no testimony to it either in the Bible or from experience. Not the mere mystery, but the absence of scriptural and experimental proof, staggers his faith.

Rejected on this ground chiefly, the difficulties, inherent in the Theory, doubtless come up and make his rejection more decided ; for he cannot avoid the query, why should such extraordinary miracles be so profusely wrought to so little practical effect ?

I await a future stage of the discussion to show that this question implies no depreciation of the real value of that precious rite, in which the children of believing parents receive the seal of their infant consecration to their Heavenly Father, Saviour and Sanctifier.

To some, the foregoing discussion may appear abstruse, and be passed over as remote from the easy run of thought. And yet, I think it makes some things plain. It throws light on this great fact, that, in His dealings with His intelligent yet sinful creatures, God uses and has furnished for our use, the exhaustless riches of His Truth. He is Truth ; infinite in the treasures, and illimitable in the comprehension, of it ; and He has made us, though finite, yet capable, in reason, understanding and moral powers, of receiving Him in and through His Truth. Therefore hath He given us the Truth, and Himself in it, and the eternal world through its shining. All this is plain and certain ; and if any other mode of imparting to us spiritual gifts, not involving the presence of Truth in its intelligent reception, be peradventure possible ; still, the ab-

sence of proof that such mode is ever adopted, and the darkness, which meets us when we come to study it, constrain us to believe that it is not the mode adopted even by Him, "whose judgments are unsearchable and whose footsteps are not known."

To others, again, the discussion may have seemed to ascribe too much, in the work of our Regeneration, to the power of "Influential motives;" to be "substituting Gospel motives for the Gospel itself;" the tendency of truths to excite love, for "the love of Christ constraining us;" and the persuasiveness of man's preaching, for the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power."* Undoubtedly there is a system, which tends to "put Christ out of Christianity, and the Holy Spirit out of the Holy Scriptures;" and, having done so, to fall down and worship, not the vacated Bible, but an Idol of its own, called Truth: and against such a system and its tendencies we may well lift a loud voice of warning. But what has this to do with a view which makes God all in all, Christ the whole hope of His people, and the Holy Spirit the One Agent, everywhere at work in the Regeneration and Sanctification of the Saints? This view, indeed, makes Truth a necessary medium of manifestation and a possibly necessary means of operation in that Di-

* Tract 67, p. 77.

vine work ; still, effectual, only because it is “the Sword of the Spirit,” only because it is “the Word of God,” and full of God in His Word.

Here, as well as elsewhere, we meet with two extremes. The one casts God out of His Word ; and then makes Speculations, and Theories, and supposed truths omnipotent ; the other divorces Truth and puts her away from God ; and then makes Him a Being who works, not only amid the darkness of constant mystery, but also amid the prodigies of debasing superstition. They are extremes equally false, and therefore equally to be avoided. We must leave God and His Truth where they necessarily are, always together, one and inseparable. In no other way shall we ever know either of them to profit. Truth manifesting God and God manifest through the Truth ; Truth testifying of God, and God convincing by the Truth ; Truth shining round all Divine things, and God, through the Truth, making all Divine things discernible ; this appears to be the eternal union and co-operation of the Infinite with the Light, in which He dwelleth. The true Idea of “Gospel motives” is—God moving in the Gospel ; the true notion of “the Love of Christ constraining us” is—Christ constraining us by the Love, which His Word makes known, and His Spirit makes affecting ; and the true conception of “the demonstra-

tion of the Spirit and of power," is—the Spirit powerfully demonstrating the efficacy of all Divine Truth, especially of that "preaching, which is not with the enticing words of man's wisdom."

III. I advance now to a third, and, so far as I can anticipate, a last, suggestion, which may be started by the views expressed in the first chapter.

Do not the views, which have been set forth in opposition to the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, land us either in the loose heresy of Pelagius, or in the gloomy belief that none, who die in Infancy, can be saved?

The argument, implied in this suggestion, may be thus more fully stated. If those, who die in Infancy without spiritual Regeneration, are *saved*, it must be because they are born without sin: and this is Pelagianism. If, on the contrary, those who die in Infancy without spiritual Regeneration, were born in sin, then they *cannot be saved*: and this is the gloomiest belief that can chill the human heart. Upon the one part or the other of this alternative are we not unavoidably cast by the views of Baptism, which have been indicated? Do not these views force us either to join the loose heresy, that we are born without sin;—or to hug the cold belief, that all, who die in Infancy, are lost?

1. In reply to this, I begin by declaring, with the Bible, that we are all, as was David, "shapen

in iniquity and conceived in sin; Ps. 51 : 5 ; and that “ that, which is born of the flesh, is flesh ; John, 3 : 6 ; and by professing, with our article, that “ Original Sin, in every person born into this world, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.” Art. ix.

This, indeed, says the critic, shows that the writer is no follower of Pelagius ;—but it does not clear his teachings of the heresy of Pelagianism. I shall, therefore, proceed to show, more at length, that the views, which I have begun to unfold, are neither Pelagian, nor loaded with the chills of perdition to dying Infants. The teachings of the Bible are certainly opposed to those of Pelagius ; and as certainly they cast no chill upon our hopes for those, who die in Infancy. They leave not our babes, through their earliest years, solitary things ; creatures of God, yet cut off from His fatherly care ; made under the operation of His Law, yet incapable of the efficacy of His grace, and—if they die in Infancy—cast out to perish with hypocrites and unbelievers !

Into the reasons for the actual condition of Infancy I do not propose to inquire. Why God has seen fit to bring the human creature into life heir to an inheritance, which may hereafter equal that of an angel in intellectual and moral wealth, yet, at its birth, actually knowing less, and less able to

care for itself, than the youngling of the dumb beast of burden, we know not, and, in this world, can never know. The reasons for this order are God's, and to Himself are satisfying. Yet I hope to show at least this ; that, whatever be its first condition, this human creature is not left, during its helplessness, in uncared-for coldness and solitude ; that, whatever be the seeming of the case, it is not thrown on a cold world, and left to bud and blossom amid nothing but its frosts, or to die and be lost among the scorers of a Saviour. However unconscious of His regards, the Christ-God looks upon Infancy with the tenderest and fondest solicitude. The intense interest and delight, with which a loving mother watches her first-born, catches the earliest gleam of his opening intelligence and moral sensibility, and seeks to nurse the young spirit up to sweet and blessed intercourse with herself, are but faint and feeble things compared with that still intenser interest and delight, with which the Infinite in love watches the Infancy of every human being, sees it^f nature unfold, and seeks to draw its young affections to Himself. The anxieties and cares and sleepless love of the *Christian* mother for her offspring are actually a part of that beautiful and beneficent system, which God has ordained, and under which He is preparing to place the Infancy of every human being, as it comes into

the world, in order that its first possible impressions may be holy, and its first possible knowledge sanctifying ; or, at least, harmonious with the holy and the sanctifying influences, which are living around its young spirit. Infancy is not uncared-for of God. He watches over it, while it is unconscious of His watching, and before it can requite His care with either gratitude or neglect. Let us, then, proceed to examine, more at length, the bearings upon Infancy of those views of Baptism, which I have begun to indicate.

To teach, says the critic, that those, who die in Infancy, without the new birth of the Spirit effected in Baptism, may be saved, is virtually to teach one of the dogmas of Pelagius, in opposition to the Bible and our article, which declare that we are born in sin, and that "birth-sin deserves God's wrath and damnation ;" the inference being that dying Infants cannot be saved without the new birth effected in Baptism. But let us look into this matter.

If any, who die in Infancy, are lost, it must be on the one or the other of these two grounds ; either that their "birth-sin deserves God's wrath and damnation," or that they have never, in Baptism, been regenerated unto a new and holy life by the Spirit.

1. Must dying Infants be lost because their "birth-sin deserves God's wrath and damnation?"

I answer, No : and, to show why I answer thus, I invite attention to the meaning of this phrase in our Article. Do these words, "Original Sin deserves God's wrath and damnation," mean that the Infant itself deserves this for being born subject to that "Infection of nature?" This cannot be. The distinction between the Infant born, as a subject for moral treatment, and the Infection, with which it is born, as an object of judicial censure, may be a nice one : nevertheless, it is a true and an essential distinction. The infection itself deserves God's condemnation ; but the involuntary subject of it cannot, for the mere fact of being born its subject, merit such a judgment. There is this difference between *original* sin, and *actual* sin. *Actual* sin is a voluntary violation of the law of God. *Original* sin is "an infection of nature" in every one "naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam ;" an "Infection," *taint*, *poison*, whatever may be meant by such terms ; and, in this character, God hates and condemns it. The primary and voluntary sin of Adam himself, and all its consequences, both of involuntary sinfulness in the Infant, and of voluntary sin in the adult, are objects of utter dislike to God ; and against them He warreth ever ; but, on the involuntarily infected Infant He looks with a Father's pity. The deep sin of Adam and its deep effect on the Race, are justly objects of "God's

wrath and damnation ;" but not the new-born babe, merely for having been made, involuntarily, subject to the awful infection. If that babe live to be capable and guilty—and guilty he will become as soon as he is capable—of giving this infection issue in acts of voluntary sin, he too, as a responsible moral agent, will come under the condemning displeasure of God ; but, until then, whatever other relation he may bear to his Maker, he bears not that of the voluntary sinner.

But, if this be so, the dying Infant is not lost, merely because "original or birth-sin deserves God's wrath and damnation." Even the actual, voluntary sinner may be saved, since a way to his salvation has been divinely opened. And yet actual sin "deserves God's wrath and damnation," even after it has been freely forgiven ; and will deserve it forever ; for if sin ceases to *deserve* judgment because it has been *forgiven*, then hath forgiveness the power to change guilt into innocence, and sin into holiness. No : all sin, original and actual, forgiven and unforgiven, deserves, and will forever deserve, God's condemnation. The dying babe, therefore, as well as the living adult, may be saved, so far as the forgiveness of its "birth-sin" is concerned, provided a way to its forgiveness has been divinely opened.

Has not such a way been opened, then ? I can-

not here go fully into the Evangelic Scheme as it touches this important point. It must be sufficient to glance at that scheme as laid down in Rom. 5 : 12-21. Whatever else that somewhat difficult Scripture may contain, it contains at least these fundamental truths : that Adam was a Type of Christ ; that the latter, in an extraordinary sense, is, at all points, or in all legal relations to our race, set over against the former ; that, as Adam brought sin and death upon all, so Christ has brought righteousness and life for all ; and that, as Adam, by one act of transgression, brought condemnation, so Christ, from many acts of transgression, has brought justification. In this scheme, indeed, is doubtless involved the truth, that, while the evils of Adam's sin are absolute, positive, the benefits of Christ's righteousness are conditional, contingent. That is : by his sin, Adam positively, actually brought death, temporal and spiritual, upon all mankind ; while by His Righteousness, Christ has brought Life, spiritual and eternal, for all men, under the conditions of the Gospel. Let us see what bearing this may have on the point before us.

In the case, then, of those, who die in Infancy, Christ, according to this Scripture, stands to them for good over against Adam for evil. As they are brought, through Adam, under the condemnation of *original* sin, so they are brought, through Christ,

to the forgiveness of that sin. This benefit is secured to them without voluntary act on their part, though not without voluntary grace on the part of Christ. By death in Infancy, He has taken them away from those conditions of the Gospel, which bind the adult, and embraced them in those mercies of the Saviour, which yearn over the babe. If, in receiving this grace of remission, their relation to Christ be involuntary, so also, in becoming subject to original sin, was their relation to Adam involuntary. It is but reasonable, therefore, that, so far as the future *penalty* of original sin is concerned, Christ, the greater, should remove what Adam, the less, has entailed. To make the principle, here involved, general ; as the first Adam brought the absolute condemnation of original sin upon the whole Race ; so the Second Adam has brought the Remission of that sin to the whole Race under the conditions appropriate to their respective cases. When, therefore, Infants are removed by death, before the commission of actual sin, they are also received to the grace of Christ, without the conditions, which bind the adult transgressor. Christ, "by the grace of God, hath tasted Death for every man." Heb. 2 : 9. As, then, He removes these Infants before they can comprehend what He hath done for them, and before they have made themselves voluntary in "the sin of the

world," so His mercy may open to them the way to Life Eternal, provided they can also be made capable of enjoying that Life :—a point, which I will presently proceed to consider. For the present, I add, that, so far as mere remission, or the removal of *penalty*, is concerned, it is the Law of the Gospel itself, that though, in the case of all, who live to commit actual sin, the DEATH of Christ can be rendered effectual only by being applied in the exercises of faith and repentance, or in that actual renewal and sanctification, which is the present work of the Spirit through the Truth, yet, in the case of all, who die in Infancy, or before the commission of actual sin, the LIFE of Christ may avail for them in Eternity without that faith and repentance, which are among the experiences of Time. As they have not become voluntary, while in the body, in following the first Adam's sin, so they need not become voluntary, in this world, in relying on the Second Adam's Righteousness.

To sum up this point ; had it not been for the work of Christ, the whole Race had perished : but, since He hath "tasted Death for every man," they only perish, who, to the fact of original sin, as an involuntary infection from our common Head, add the guilt of actual sin, as the intelligent, voluntary issue of their own minds ; and who, thus guilty and defiled, never become renewed by the Holy Ghost

unto faith and repentance, and are never sanctified by the Spirit unto holiness of heart and life ; but, on the contrary, either by a conscious volition, or by cherishing tempers, which would prompt such an act, reject the offers of pardon and life from the Saviour, and thus seal, beyond reversal, the sentence of their own condemnation.

This view of the efficacy of Christ's Death and Sacrifice accounts for the fact that so little is said in the Bible of those, who die in Infancy. Towards Infancy and Childhood, indeed, as states of life, the Bible is full of tender regard. The language of Christ to those, who would have kept the little children from him, may be taken as the best expression of that regard in fewest words ; while it shows that, between original sin in Infancy and actual sin in manhood, there is a broad and important difference, since the adults, whom Jesus addressed, needed "*conversion*" to make them like the little children, whom He blessed. Matt. 18 : 3 ; Mar. 10 : 16. But, on the case of those, who *die in Infancy*, the Bible maintains an almost unbroken silence. The comforted mourning of the penitent David over his dead child, 2 Sam. 12 : 23,—“ I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me,”—is the plainest, if not the only word ever uttered to break that silence ; and it implies the same difference, already noticed, between original sin in

that smitten babe, and actual sin in that broken-hearted believer. The slaughtered babes of Bethlehem have, by some, been called "infant martyrs for Christ;" and yet the Evangelist says not a word of their state by nature, or of their condition after death. So far as the Bible, here and there, points in the direction of those who die in Infancy, it opens glimpses into something bright and blessed; but in the remarkable silence, which it generally observes, it significantly intimates that this is a case, to which the ordinary conditions of the Gospel do not apply; that, as "what the Law says, it says to them that are *under* the Law," so what the Bible says, it says to them that are *under* the Bible, and can understand its elementary and fundamental teachings; and that dying Infants, not belonging to this class, are to be left in the arms of Christ, that, as a loving Saviour, who hath "tasted death for them," He may "lay His hands upon them and bless them," or that, as He takes them away from the ordinary lot of voluntarily sinful men, He may take them to that bosom of mercy, to that freeness of forgiveness, into which the actual transgressor can be admitted in no other way than that prescribed in the Gospel.

On the whole, then, we may confidently conclude, that, though, in the language of our Article, "Original sin deserves God's wrath and damnation," yet,

those, who die in Infancy, are not, for this reason, lost ; but, on the contrary, may be saved ; a way to free forgiveness in their case having been divinely opened.

2. In the second place, then, must those who die in Infancy, be lost because they have never, in Baptism, been regenerated unto a new and holy life by the Spirit ?

I repeat, here, what I have elsewhere intimated, that no one, guilty of actual sin, can be saved without the new-birth of the Spirit unto faith, repentance and holy obedience. The heart that has once, consciously and voluntarily, conceived sin against God, can never know peace with Him until it has been not only pardoned, but also *purified* ; that is, reconciled, renewed and cleansed of the defilement, which that accountable act of transgression developed. It is enough to say that this is not the case now in view. The dying Infant is not guilty of *actual* sin.

To proceed, then ; if dying Infants need any previous change of nature in order to their happiness with God, they cannot need the specific change, required of those, who have become capable and guilty of actual sin : for this change takes its first cognizable steps in Repentance and faith ; and it is evident that, whatever else they may need, dying Infants need not these.

(1.) They need not *repentance*.

For they have never committed a sin, of which they can, or should repent. After what has been said, it would be needless to press this remark, were it not for the view, which some have entertained, that we ought to repent of Adam's sin, or of original sin, in the sense of his first personal transgression. This, even as required of Adults, may be set down as unbiblical theology. We may mourn, with the deepest grief, of which a smitten spirit is capable, over

. "Man's first disobedience and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world and all our woe;"

yet this grief would not be repentance, any more than grief for the loss of a first-born would be repentance. I cannot repent of the sin of Adam any more than I can of the sin of Iscariot. If, then, this is true of adults, much more than this is true of Infants. Dying in Infancy, they not only cannot, but need not repent whether of Adam's sin, or of its transmitted effect on themselves. From Adam, indeed, they have inherited "an infection of nature," termed "Original sin;" but into actual sin, as the fatal development of this, they have never fallen. They, therefore, need no repentance. They *have* nothing, and have *done* nothing, of which they either can or should repent.

(2.) They need not *faith*.

For faith, as reliance upon Christ, stands related to the offered pardon of *actual* sin. It is that act, in which the soul looks to Christ, when the Holy Spirit has "convinced her of sin," especially of the *actual* sin of *unbelief*, and has thus shown her the need of a Saviour. As a general reliance on God, and on what He hath testified in His Word, faith has, indeed, a wider scope than this, though not a different nature ; but, as that act, which receives forgiveness of sin, it can have no other place than that of the believing look, which the soul fixes upon Christ, when the Holy Spirit has convinced her of *actual* sin. But dying Infants have no actual sin, especially not that of *unbelief*, of which the Spirit can, or should convince them. They need not *faith*, therefore, either as the hand, by which *pardon* is received, or as a step in that process, through which comes purification. For, of *original* sin they cannot be convicted, any more than I can be legally convicted of the sin of my neighbor ; nor need they be convicted of it, any more than an unhappy youth, infected with a hereditary disease, needs to be legally convicted of the sin of his parent, in which that disease originated. Moreover, we have just seen that faith, in this connection, is that act, which apprehends Christ as a Saviour from the guilt of *actual* sin, and which opens a

channel, through which the heart becomes purified from the defilement of that sin. Dying Infants, therefore, having neither the guilt, nor the defilement of *actual* sin, have no more need of *faith* than they have of Repentance.

But, repentance and faith are the principal, leading steps in that change, which every *actual* sinner needs in order to his salvation. As, therefore, those that die in Infancy, need not take these *steps*, so neither do they need that *change*. Consequently, so far as this point also is concerned, they may be saved. Whatever else may be necessary to their salvation, that change is not necessary.

Thus far, then, the Idea of Baptism, which I am unfolding, lands not its advocate either in a Pelagian denial of original sin and of its inherited consequences, or in that chilling dogma, which teaches that all, who die in Infancy must be lost. On the contrary, it opens bright and cheering views of their future state ; views full of the sunlight of hope, and rich in the prospect of glory, to all whom God, in His chastening goodness, is pleased to beckon away ere the stain of actual sin has rested on their spirits. If they cannot have, neither do they need, that specifically renewing and sanctifying change, which is required of all others. If they do not live to receive that gift of a renewed mind, which the Holy Spirit was sent to

impart, neither do they live to feel that voluntary breaking out of the disease of sin, the workings of which Christ came to destroy. Through Christ's sacrifice, the infection of *original* sin may be forgiven them. Through God's intervention, the stain of *actual* sin has not been contracted. The pains of *temporal* death come upon them, not in punishment of *voluntary* guilt, but as a part of the original penalty, which follows involuntary infection. In them Adam still dies for his first offence. In them Christ now lives through His satisfying obedience. The first Adam plunged them into the peril of *original* sin. The second Adam travailed for them in bloody pain, and thereby delivered them out of their peril. The former left them to a state of misery, as the inevitable consequence of introducing sin into the world. The latter wins for them a life of blessedness, and thus makes them part of "the travail of His soul, which He sees and is satisfied."

2. But, objects the critic, although dying Infants, in order to their salvation, need not in this life the specific change effected in repentance and faith, yet they need that gift of the Spirit, whereby the infection of Original Sin may be removed from their nature ; and this is the mystery wrought for them in Infant Baptism.

(1.) In reply to this, however, and at the risk of

some little repetition, I remark, first, that the Infection of Original Sin is *not* removed by Infant Baptism. If it were, I insist that those Infants, who survive their Baptism until "years of discretion," ought in all cases to live without *actual* sin. The only reason why *actual* sin is the universal experience of accountable men is to be found in the fact that they universally carry within them the infection of *Original* sin. If, therefore, this infection were removed by Infant Baptism, the baptized, if they live, ought to live without actual sin. There would be no reason why they should not so live. The contrary supposition would be a reproach, moreover, to the great work of Redemption. God has been at an infinite expense of Love and Power in the gift of His Son to be a Saviour from Sin, and in the mission of His Spirit to apply that gift. After all this, then—and who can tell what all this means?—after having thus remedied the fall of Adam by removing its only effect on the unconscious Infant, would He suffer that effect to be straightway *repeated* by the renewed fall of the now sinless babe of baptism into *actual*, as well as into Original sin? This would be suffering the baptized to sin *literally* "after the similitude of Adam's transgression," i. e. to fall from a really *sinless* state. In vain, then, would the infinitely loving Father of men have emptied

heaven of its richest, fullest treasure of Love and Power to save lost men. His work, at its very first application, would have proved a failure ; and it would be a mockery, as well as an irreverence, to continue to preach its value and efficacy to a dying world. No. If, as the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration teach, the removal of Original Sin be the mystery, effected in Infant Baptism, then, in all cases, upon coming to "years of discretion," the baptized must be expected to live without *actual* sin.

But what is the state of facts on this point? What says Experience? Its universal testimony is, that such surviving Infants do *not*, upon reaching "years of discretion," live without actual sin ; and therefore that the infection of Original Sin is *not* removed by Baptism. And what says the Bible? It testifies the same thing, and its testimony may be summed in one of its own sayings : "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not." According to this testimony, therefore, all, baptized and unbaptized, carry the infection of Original Sin. And finally, what says our Article? Its testimony is identical with that of both the Bible and Experience. It declares that "the Infection of Original Sin remaineth ; yea in them that are regenerated : " and this remaining Infection is at once the reason why, if we survive

to years of moral action, we invariably sin after Baptism ; and a proof that, in thus sinning, we do “ *not* sin after the similitude of Adam’s transgression,” Rom. 5 : 14, by falling from a *sinless* state, but after the similitude of all Adam’s posterity, by giving *voluntary* issue to the lingering infection within.

(2.) Again : If Infant Baptism were the necessary mystery for removing the Infection of Original Sin, and thus for leaving the soul of the dying Infant, before the seal of Death is set, free of all sinfulness, as its only capacity for heaven ; then, what would become of those countless myriads of Infants, who die *without* Baptism, not only in heathen, but even in Christian lands ?

This shows that this Theory of Baptismal Regeneration is really the most cruel, that was ever invented. Many of the advocates of this Theory do not, and all of them, if they consistently carried out their principle, would not, hesitate to avow their belief, that the mystery of Baptism is so necessary to the Salvation of dying Infants, that, without it, they can not be saved. And so, the Theory, which thinks to save a *part*, consigns the rest, in all their infinite myriads, to perdition ! It is, I repeat, the cruelest Theory ever invented. The simple truth is, that the mystery of Baptism is not a specific for the removal of Original Sin. It is

not thus necessary to the salvation of dying Infants.

(3.) For, there are overpowering probabilities, nay, high moral certainties, clustering around this further assertion, that the removal of Original Sin, before the hour of death, is not necessary to the salvation of any one, Infant or Adult.

The question, whether the complete sanctification of the soul in this life from the stain of *actual* sin be, or be not possible, is one, which touches not the present point, and which, therefore, in this discussion, I need not moot. The position here taken is, that the removal of *Original* sin before death is not *necessary* to the Salvation of any one, whether it be the dying Infant, or the dying man of years. The best of Christians carry the Infection of Original Sin, with more or less of its troublous effects in actual sin, to the very hour of death. This, as we have seen, is the concurrent testimony of Experience, the Bible, and our Article;—three unimpeachable witnesses on the point. “There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good” in such a sense, that he “sinneth not.” This is the state of *facts* in the case. Whatever becomes of the question of the *possible* complete sanctification of the soul from *actual* sin in this life, the fact comes to this; that, in *some* of its forms, actual sin clings to all living men, even to the “*just*.” But the

presence of *actual* sin, in *any* of its forms, though in the most occult movements of the will, or in the most secret state of the affections, is full proof of the co-presence of *original* sin. The *actual* would not live an instant, were it not sustained by the co-life of the *original*. The original is the only aliment of the actual. The infection, therefore, of original sin not only "remaineth," as our Article asserts, but it remaineth until *death* in even the most deeply experienced and truly ripened Christian. Hence, at their dying hour, comes their *mourning* over the remaining effects within them of this deep-fixed infection ; and hence, at that hour, they are driven to Christ, alone, as the ground of their hope ; and cleave to Him in death, with a fondness of love, and an energy of faith, and a thoroughness of self-renunciation, unknown amid the practical experiences of healthful life. If the Infection of original sin must be removed before death, in order to render salvation possible, then even these true Christians,—notwithstanding all the wonders of Redemption, which have been wrought for them, and all the wonders of grace, which have been wrought in them,—cannot be saved. From their Saviour they must, after all, part and perish. In all the earnestness and sweet agony of their last love for Him and of their last faith in Him, and of their last renunciation of all else for Him, they

must part from Him and perish ! Such is the direct, inevitable, inexorable logic of the Theory in question !

But, if Original Sin thus remain to trouble even the dying Christian, when *are* we to look for its needed, final and total removal ? I reply ; Perhaps, this final and total obliteration before death is impossible. Perhaps, the deep mysteries of our last change, and the deeper mysteries of our first look upon the unveiled God-in-Christ, are necessary finally and utterly to obliterate the dark infection, which our nature has received, and to present it perfect again in the Image of its Creator. Perhaps such a final extinction of original sin is to be the closing act in the practical working out of the mystery of our Redemption. Before the fall, we know, God and man met "face to face." Then, to *look* upon God implied an unharmed "likeness" to Him. But, the fall ensued ; and then, in displeasure, God withdrew from sight and from all familiarity of intercourse with man ; and that loss of the vision of God was both the *effect* and an *aggravation* of man's unlikeness to Him. Yet, in that double loss, God left not man hopeless. In measured progress, He at length made Himself again manifest : not, indeed, as at first, "face to face," but, in promise, in prophecy, in type, in Ritual, "in the flesh," "in Christ :" still partly hid-

den, yet in part, most graciously and very gloriously "manifest." And now, through this graciously renewed, yet still partial manifestation of Himself, through the wondrous Sacrifice on the Cross for the free forgiveness of our sins, and through the blessed work of the Spirit in the incipient and progressive sanctification of our souls, He prepares as many as resist Him not, as grieve Him not, for a *reintroduction* to His unveiled presence, and for a final and perfect obliteration of all remaining unlikeness to Him. To be thus, through Christ, by the Spirit, reintroduced into His unveiled and approving presence, will be to become once more perfect in His Image. Such is evidently the teaching of the Divine John, who knew best what is the effect of "leaning on the bosom" of his but partially manifested Christ-God. "Beloved," said he, "*now* are we the sons of God;"—sons by adoption and grace, however imperfect, here;—"and it doth not yet appear what we *shall* be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be LIKE Him; for we shall SEE HIM AS HE IS." 1 John, 3:2. *That* will complete the work. *Here*, more or less of unlikeness to Him remains: but *there*, our likeness to Him will again become perfect; why?—"because we shall SEE HIM AS HE IS."

But, whether this vision of God be the *necessary* summing up of the mystery of our Redemption, or

not, it is often, perhaps always, the *actual* summing up of that mystery. The work of our Salvation, in its effect within us, often, perhaps always, has its completion, its last finishing touches, in the power of that first look of the Soul upon the unveiled glory of God, to which John refers.

And now, to apply what has been said ;—If this first look be either necessary, or sufficient, to obliterate original sin from the soul of the aged Saint, when he comes to stand before God ; much more will it be sufficient to obliterate the Infection from that *Infant* Spirit, which, before committing *actual* sin, returns to Him, “ who gave it,” a soul redeemed by Christ, and presented to the Father for its first sin-extinguishing look upon “ the glorious God.”

It has, indeed, been objected, that, in the *regenerate* Christian, at the hour of death, a work *begun* and more or less nearly completed, has only to reach its full and final consummation by being brought fully and finally under the power of God’s sanctifying presence ; while, in the dying Infant, the needed work of sanctification has made neither progress nor even a *beginning*. I reply, that, in the dying Infant, there is nothing to be removed but an original, *unactuated* Infection, to which a sinful will has never given an intensified inveteracy ; while, in the adult Christian, are to be obliterated the remains both of original and of *actual* sin ; i. e.

of a sinfulness, *voluntarily* indulged, and therefore, deep-fixed, obstinately lingering, and long-trained in the war between nature and grace, between the flesh and the spirit ; a war, the awful earnestness, and the life-long obstinacy of which, in himself and others, the Apostle Paul has described in the seventh Chapter of his Epistle to the Romans. I repeat, therefore, if his first look upon a gracious and glorious God, unveiled, is enough to bring this war to an end in the eternal peace and perfect purity of the dying Saint ; much more will it be sufficient to obliterate from the soul of the dying Infant an Infection, which has never been actuated amid the intensities of a Conflict so fearfully willful !

It is worthy of remark that, in distinction from "the first Adam," who was simply "made a living soul," "the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit ;" 1 Cor. 15 : 45. The former was made simply *alive* : the latter was made *life-giving* also, not only in His power to raise the *literally* dead, and in His grace to reward with life eternal, but also in His efficiency to quicken a sinful soul to the life of holiness. This quickening work He does on *adults* by His Spirit and His Word ; but who shall say that, when He calls the Infant to His arms by the voice of Death, He is not Himself, to that then opening intelligence, a quickening, life-giving

Energy? As the Providential Ruler, during His Mediatorship, of the world which He has redeemed, Death is His Dispensation. By the voice of Death, then, He still says of such dying ones, "Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." And then, as the young soul leaps at the sound into those open arms of love, who shall tell me that the gracious Jesus does not then lay a divine hand upon it and bless it then? If, as we believe, He calls such, even though unbaptized, into His heavenly kingdom, some way He must have of previously fitting them for its purities. Who, then, shall doubt that this way becomes manifest amid the mysteries of that passage from mortal to Immortality? *Truth* in Him, who *is* "The Truth;" *Light* in Him, who *is* "The Light;" and *Life* in Him, who *is* "The Life," beam then on the open intelligence of the spiritually-waking babe in Jesus; and, as he looks up into the face of his Christ-God, and "sees Him as He is," he becomes "like Him" as he gazes; and so, passes on towards that heaven of life beyond the Resurrection and the Judgment-scene, as the proper and the final sequence of a transformation so divine. It is no more than reasonable to believe that such a soul, removed in Infancy, untouched by the voluntary sin, corruption and evil influence, with which this world is filled, and which

are such early and powerful stimulants to all that is evil within us, may feel that first quickening embrace and look with a more penetrating power than that realized by the Christian, who, after having been defiled with *actual* sin, is, in this life, privileged to "behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord," and is thus really, though gradually and imperfectly, "changed into the same Image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord." If this mere *reflection* of God upon the eye of *faith*, beholding only His "manifestation in the *flesh*," be thus efficient in gradually, though but imperfectly removing from the soul the deep fixed stains of *actual* sin; much more shall that *direct* vision of God, vouchsafed to the sinful, yet unsinning Infant Spirit, be efficient in at once obliterating the Infection of original sin; an Infection, which, however fatal in its developed activities, lies yet in involuntary Infancy, the inactive, undeveloped principle of evil.

I alluded, just now, to "the voluntary sin, corruption, and evil influence, with which this world is filled, and which are such early and powerful stimulants to all that is *evil within us*." By this phraseology it will at once be seen that I have no affinity with the theory, which teaches that the sin, corruption and evil influence, with which, some how, our world has become filled, are the tempters,

which originally lead our naturally sinless hearts, by the power of bad example, into the ways of wickedness. That would be the *Pelagianism*, condemned in our Ninth Article. What I say is, that, as the Infection of Original Sin is in our nature, and sure in all cases to act, when carried into years of accountability, so the voluntary sin, corruption and evil influence, which fill the world, may prove to that inward Infection like impure air to the seeds of disease already latent in the body ; developing that disease into quicker and more virulent growth ; and that the soul of the dying Infant, being removed by the early act of God from this morally polluted world to a world of pure spiritual airs, must feel its first quickening embrace in the arms of Jesus, and its first quickening look upon the manifested Christ-God, as He stands "face to face" with the absorbed beholder, more penetratingly and more effectually than the glimpses of *faith* in this life can be felt by the Christian, who only sees the Divine glory "as in a glass," and that, "through a glass darkly ;" and,—following up the thought—at least as penetratingly and as effectually as even the *direct* vision of that manifested God can be felt by the adult soldier of the Cross, who comes to that vision out of the dark struggle with Death and out of the defiling dust of the battle with *actual* sin.

(4.) But, I have a further observation to make.

The whole apparent force of that third suggestion, which has led to this discussion, lies in an ambiguous use of the term, *sinful*. If Infants be sinful, it is asked, must they not have a new and holy life wrought in them before death, in order to their Salvation ?

What has already been said in this reply, shows the necessity of distinguishing, more carefully than we have yet done, between being *sinful*, and being *sinner*s ; or between *original* and *actual* Sin. Let us then look more attentively at this point.

What constitutes the precise ultimate, or specific difference between the two, we know not, and probably never shall know, until we come to read that difference by the light, that shineth in heaven. Still, there are some things, which show that they are different, and that the difference is important. We know, for instance, that, in *Original Sin*, the new-born babe is not strictly or legally *guilty* ; that is, he is not guilty by a voluntary consent to the Infection. The Infection is in him, not by his own act, but by the fact of his descent from a sinful stock. But, in *actual* sin, the adult is strictly, legally *guilty*. He is guilty by a voluntary consent and indulgence in sin, as his own free act. Again ; we know that, in estimating *Original* sin, the Infection alone “deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.” But, in estimating *actual* sin, “the wrath

of God abideth" both on the act and on the actor. These circumstances show that the two things are really different ; though they show us not in what the difference consists. They are not parts, but only consequences of that difference. The difference itself may be something analogous to that between a seed, and the plant, which it produces. A seed never produces its plant without the concurrence of certain conditions ; but the plant, when produced, contains within itself multiplied reproductions of its seed. More appositely still, the difference may be somewhat analogous to that between a *poison* and the *disease*, which it generates in the body. The former, if it remain, is sure to produce the latter ; and yet the latter is essentially different from the former. But, whatever this difference may be, who can say that it does not furnish a reason why they, who die in Infancy, may be saved, notwithstanding the fact that they carry, from their brief passage through a corrupt stock, the infection of *original*, since they carry not the guilt of *actual* sin into the presence of the Infinitely Holy.

I said, just now, that the difference between original and actual sin may be somewhat analogous to that between poison and the disease, which it generates. Indeed, our Ninth Article suggests this analogy, when it defines Original Sin to be "an

Infection of our nature." Infection is that, which "taints, corrupts, or *poisons*, by communication from one to another." Perhaps by dwelling on this analogy, the light, which we have on this point, may be somewhat increased.

Poison, when lodged in the body, and before it has begun to act, may be expelled, and thus rendered harmless. But when it begins to act, it generates *disease*, and can no longer be expelled, except with its effects. It must have an *antidote*, or *neutralizer*; otherwise, the disease, which it has generated, will certainly prove fatal. So Original Sin, as a *moral* "poison," an "Infection of nature," may, peradventure, before it has been developed by *voluntary action*, be expelled, and thus leave the soul to spiritual health. But, as soon as it begins to *act* in the intelligent volitions of its responsible subjects, it generates spiritual disease, and can no longer be expelled, save with the last of its effects. It must have an *antidote*, or *neutralizer*; otherwise that disease will inevitably prove fatal.

And then, following the analogy, we know another thing. Poison and the disease, which it generates, are not one and the same, any more than the sword, which wounds us, and the fever, which rages from the wound, are one and the same. Hence poison, before and after the generating action, admits of entirely different treatment. So, original and actual

sin are not one and the same thing ; and hence they may admit of very different treatment before and after the period of moral accountability. In the dying Infant, the moral poison is expelled in God's own way. First, its action is prevented, not by Baptism, but by the stroke of Death, before that poison has been taken by the will into *voluntary* circulation : and then, the infection itself is wholly removed amid the mysteries of that last act of mortal, and that first of immortal life, by the quickening energy of a Divine embrace, and a direct vision of the perfect God, graciously vouchsafed for the sake of "Him, who hath tasted death for every man," and who, by the voice of His Providence, hath said, "Suffer the little child to come unto Me, and forbid him not." And so, the at last twice-born babe becomes "like" Jesus, because he "sees Him as He is." But—in the adult, this treatment becomes impossible. The Will has taken the moral poison into circulation, into *voluntary* activity. Spiritual disease has been developed. And now, if ever healed, that disease must be healed by its appointed *Antidote*, or Remedy, the Mercy of God in Christ, applied and made effectual by the Holy Spirit, in the use of Truth, unto the quickening of Repentance and the sanctifying of Faith, with the present fruits of Love, Obedience and Holiness.

These remarks, indeed, are an inadequate illustration of the difference between *original* and *actual* sin. Nevertheless, they show that there is such a difference, and that this difference detects the fallacy in the suggestion, which has been considered. The Infant who "sleeps in Jesus" by early death, and the adult who "sleeps in Jesus" after a responsible life, were both *sinful*: but the latter only was an *actual*, or voluntary sinner. They are both saved by God's mercy through Christ; but each is saved by a different application of that mercy.

At the same time, we see that there is no force in the last form of the objection, which I have just been considering. And now, I beg special attention to what I am going to add. It is a mistake of the very genius of the Gospel to suppose that, in order to salvation, the Infection of Original Sin must be removed before the hour of Death. This is to demand that the Image of God shall be, not only in the process of a renewed formation in the soul, but also brought to its last finishing touch, in the present life; and this is more than multitudes, doubtless more than any, of even the eminent Saints of Christ attain while in the flesh. Christ, it is true, came to destroy sin, as "the work of the devil;" and ultimately He will effect His object, so that not a sherd of the broken image of evil shall

remain in any one of His disciples. Still, even if we were to suppose it possible, it is a mistake of the very genius of His Gospel to suppose it necessary to salvation, that the last stroke in His work should be struck this side of the grave. Christ's main purpose, so far as the effect of His work falls within the present life, is to bring men within the reach and embrace of mercy, to open before them the door of the kingdom of heaven ; and to set them in the way, which passes through its entrance. To illustrate this point, the whole view, which the Bible gives of the Fall and the Recovery of mankind, may be thus briefly stated.

As to the FALL ; by his first disobedience, Adam opened and spread the broad roll of a flying CURSE over the whole race of man. His act was "*Fons et origo malorum*," a fountain of malign effects. It separated his race, as well as himself, from God ; and thus separated, the whole fell into a state, which rendered it certain that every individual, "naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam," would, on reaching years of action, commit *actual sin*. That state of the race, including this attendant certainty, is what we denominate ORIGINAL SIN. It is a state, over which "God's wrath and damnation" rest ; and at the same time, it includes every individual, "naturally engendered of his offspring," from Adam to the last of his stock.

As to the RECOVERY ; Christ, the Second Adam, by His obedience unto death, brought in a BLESSING, which, in the possibilities of its application, is co-extensive with the primal Curse. He opened the Door of Mercy to the entire race. He "tasted Death for every man." He made eternal Life possible to every one, "naturally engendered of his offspring," from Adam to the last of his stock.

According to this view, the infancy of every human being is embraced in that general provision of the Mercy of God in Christ Jesus, which opens the possibility of salvation to all mankind ; and, dying in that condition, before the commission of *voluntary* transgression, or under the infection of *Original Sin* only, there is, in the nature of the case, no reason why that Infant, as well as the aged Saint, who also carries *Original Sin*, through the dark mystery of death, into the bright presence of God, should not again become "like Him" because he has come to "see Him as He is."

But, if the life of the human being reach to years of moral action, of actual sin, he enters a state not covered by that general provision of mercy. That is, he passes from the condition of Infancy under *Original Sin* into a state of personal liability for the commission of voluntary transgression, of *actual Sin*. In this state, salvation is still possible to him ; but it depends now on other terms, the full condi-

tions of the Gospel as addressed to those, who are capable of the faith and the repentance, which the Gospel requires. Before he can again pass availably within the embrace of mercy, he must, personally and for himself, have "Repentance toward God and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." His Sin must be slain by that Spirit, whose "Sword is the Word of God." His soul must be regenerated by that Holy One, whose quickenings and sanctifyings are "through the Truth." This is the full method of Salvation by the Gospel. This is what the Bible says to them that are under the Bible. All, who thus come to Christ, making voluntary Covenant with Him, and "holding the beginning of their confidence steadfast unto the end," are saved, not because, in this life, they become free from Original Sin, and perfect in the recovered image of God, but because they are, by faith, in Him, who *is* perfect, and who will finally perfect them, when, after the blessed trials, and the loving discipline, and the glorious progress of time, He brings them into the full vision of God, that they may "see Him as He is" and that He may thus "present them faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy."

Thus viewed, the Gospel does not, as some charge, encourage indolence in the Christian life, or allow men to rest satisfied with mere half-way

attainments in holiness. On the contrary, it sets every regenerate heart to a panting after perfection ; it sets every foot, which has been " turned toward God's testimonies," and into the way of life, boldly and resolutely on the race *towards* perfection ; and it throws unwonted terrors on the path of him, who, having started on this race, carelessly suffers a pause in his progress, or a rest to his pantings *after* perfection. At the same time, however, the Gospel, thus viewed, sheds not only hope, but " the full assurance of hope," on the way of him, who, having been regenerated by the Spirit unto repentance and faith, thus sets forth and thus perseveres on the Christian course ; even though, amid the weakness of nature, and the intensities of his conflict with evil, he come to the goal with something still of Sin remaining in him. He has the beginnings of the " Life hid with Christ in God ;" and he knows to his deep joy, that, when he comes to " see Him," he shall be fully " LIKE Him, because he shall SEE HIM AS HE IS." This is what makes Christ A GOSPEL to the poor, feeble, wounded lambs, whom He has gathered to his bosom, with the assurance they shall yet be safely housed with Him in the Heavenly Fold, to feel no more the lingering weariness, or the lingering wounds, of indwelling sin.

And now, what are the results of what has been

said, as it affects the whole case before us? They are evidently these.

All, who have died, and all who are yet to die, in Infancy, whether in Christian or in Heathen lands, in all ages, and in all nations, have died and will die within the embrace of God's redeeming and saving mercy in Christ Jesus. And thus the Heathen are shown to be Christ's "Inheritance," not only by purchase, but in part by "Possession ;" and when we come to listen to the Infant Choirs around the Throne, we may see, not only how literally, but also how largely true were the Saviour's words, "Of such is the kingdom of Heaven."

Passing, now, from those, who die in infancy, to those, who survive to "years of discretion,"—that great mass of responsible beings, to whom the Bible is addressed, and with whose case it is mainly concerned,—it appears Scriptural, as well as reasonable, to hope that they only are lost, who voluntarily reject Christ and grieve from their hearts the Holy Spirit of life ; or who voluntarily and perseveringly do violence to the Law written in their hearts by the finger of God, and thus cherish those tempers, which would "crucify afresh the Son of God," were He preached to them, and "do despite unto the Spirit of grace," were He to strive with their consciously rebellious hearts. The Bible, indeed, says that, "without *faith* it is impossible to please God ;" and

that, "whosoever believeth *not* shall be damned ;" but after what has been said, it is scarcely necessary to repeat, that such expressions touch not the case of those, who die in infancy, or that of those, who never hear of Christ, or are incapable of learning of Him when they hear. They are but specimens of what the Bible says to them, that are under the Bible, and can understand what the Bible says. Of such the expressions are solemnly true ; but, to such they are manifestly limited.

To the views, advanced in the former edition of this Treatise and in reply to this last or third Suggestion, the following objections were then raised : 1. That those views seemed to make the development of moral character dependent, not on *native* tendencies, but on the *subsequent* moral atmosphere, in which it is placed ; 2. That they make *fitness* for heaven a *consequent* of, and not a *qualification for*, heaven ; and 3. That they take it for granted, that because the *remains* of original and actual sin are, by his first look upon God, "*as He is*," obliterated from the soul of the previously regenerated and partially sanctified *Adult* ; therefore, *Original Sin itself* may, at the hour of death, and by that same first beholding of the manifested God in Christ, be obliterated from the soul of the ~~un~~^{re}generated, and ~~un~~sanctified *Infant*. In rewriting the Treatise, I have held these objections in mind ;

and, I trust, have made it evident that they are without force ; and that, in rejecting the commonly received Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, under all those modifications, which leave it still itself, we are not landed in the error of the Pelagians, as we are not, in the chilling belief, that Salvation is impossible to dying Infants. We may heartily retain the doctrine of Original Sin, in all the strength of the language used in our Ninth Article, and yet rejoicingly believe, that those, who die in Infancy, are saved ; because, over against “the first Adam,” who brought the race under condemnation, stands Christ, “the second Adam,” who, under appropriate *conditions*, has opened the way to justification for all : because they, who die in Infancy, as they cannot *have*, so *need not*, the specific change, which is effected in Repentance and Faith ; and because, even if they *could* have, they do *not need*, in order to Salvation, the mystery claimed to be effected in Baptism by the gift of the Holy Spirit for the obliteration of Original Sin. As the dying *Adult* believer feels the *last* wrong pulse of “the first Adam” cease to beat under his first view of the unveiled God, and amid the finally full flow of that Life, which he had received in the new-birth of the Spirit through the Truth ; so the Infant Soul, just passing through the gate of Death, may feel the beating of the *first* pulse of that Life,

as he is received into the arms of "the Second Adam," Who "is a quickening Spirit," and Who, by the voice of His Providence, has just said, "Suffer the little child to come unto me, and forbid him not." At such a quickening, as the young spirit, with sweet surprise, looks, as it were, out of those arms of mercy, up into the unveiled face of its Christ-God, it becomes "LIKE Him," indeed, because it "SEES HIM AS HE IS." Original Sin dies in the gaze, and the heaven beyond becomes a consequent to the blissful transformation.

Finally : in the prolonged discussion, which has filled the preceding Chapters, it has been shown with, I think, reasonable certainty, 1. That the Theory of Regeneration, which makes Baptism a Mystery, a "miracle," whereby the Holy Spirit imparts Christ, in His very Incarnate nature, to the baptized Infant, as the seed, or principle of a new and at first sinless life, is without any support from the Bible : 2. That, short of this, there is nothing, on which we can rest, until we come to that Scriptural change of our nature, which is effected by the Spirit in the use of Truth : 3. That this change, having its principal steps in Repentance and Faith, is impossible in Infancy : and 4. That the rejection of the above Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, in its variously modified forms, is entirely consistent with the language of

our Ninth Article on the subject of Original Sin ; while, at the same time, it opens bright and blessed views of the future state of dying Infants—one of the most interesting portions of the human Race.

The author is well aware that to the views, thus presented, many will continue to object. Even to some minds, with whom, in the main, he agrees, they may not appear wholly free from difficulty. Indeed, on this subject, it may not be possible to reach any view, which shall feel the pressure of no difficulty at all. The most, that can be hoped for, is to find that point of view, which makes Scripture most harmonious with itself, and which leaves the least and fewest difficulties in the way of a clear and settled faith. Were Theology, at *all* points, free of difficulty, it would not be of a piece with all the rest of God's Sciences. At least, the mind, which could so penetrate all its depths, as to throw the light of demonstration *everywhere*, would thereby give proof that it had taken one step, if no more, in advance of even the Inspired men themselves of olden times.

•

CHAPTER IV.

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM STATED AND ILLUSTRATED.

IN what I have thus far said on the subject of Baptism, I have been intent on three points ; 1, that our regeneration unto a new and spiritual life is the work of the Holy Spirit, wrought on the intelligent mind, in the use of divine Truth ; 2, that this work cannot be wrought in the Baptism of Infants, because, as our Church herself teaches, the mind, at that "tender age," is not capable of the Repentance and faith, which the work involves ; and 3, that the alleged mystery of Baptism, which consists in an actual communication to us of the Divine nature, especially as manifest in the Incarnate Son ; a communication effected by the Holy Spirit in and of the sanctified and sanctifying waters of Baptism, and characterizing the Theory of Baptismal regeneration, as now currently taught ; is, in all its modifications, unsanctioned by Scripture, and even if abstractly possible with God, yet perhaps practically impossible, on the principles of that

nature, in which God has constituted, and upon which He deals with, man ; while, as a matter of fact, we have no evidence that such a mystery in Baptism is ever wrought.

The view of the new-Birth, which I am advocating, is clearly taught in the following passage, with a few remarks on which, by way of bringing the subject again before us, I will introduce what I have yet to say.

1.) James, 1 : 18. "Of his own will *begat* He us *with the word of Truth*, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures : " literally, "He who willed hath begotten us by the word of Truth : " [βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας : not ἐγέννησεν, as in 1 Cor. 4 : 15, and elsewhere : the two words, however, are of relative significancy and of equal extent of meaning.]

Nothing can be clearer than this passage as to the fact, which it asserts. God, putting His own "*will*" into, or with, "the Word of Truth," "*begat*" those early Christians and "made them first fruits of His creatures." If this be not the work of the new-Birth, of being begotten to the new life of the Spirit by the word of Truth, then it will be impossible to find that work described, or asserted, in the Bible, as the result of any agency, or of any instrumentality.

An attempt has, indeed, been made to show that

"the Word" is only a *remote* instrument of the new-Birth, while *Water*, jointly with the Spirit, is the *immediate source* of that birth. It is argued that "Baptism is spoken of as the source of our spiritual birth, as no other cause is, save God ;" and the reason for the assertion is, that the same preposition is used when speaking of Water, as when speaking of the Spirit and of God. "Except a man be born ἐξ ὕδατος, *of* Water." "That which is born ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, *of* the Spirit." John, 3 : 5, 6. "Which were born . . . ἐκ θεοῦ, *of* God." John, 1 : 13. Whereas, in speaking of "The word of Truth," as "the more remote instrument" of that birth, a different preposition is used ; "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, διὰ λόγου, *by* the Word of God." 1 Pet. 1 : 23. "I have begotten you, διὰ τοῦ ἐναγγελίου, '*by*,' or through the Gospel." 1 Cor. 4 : 15. But the criticism is, I apprehend, unsound. The expressions, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, of the Spirit, and ἐκ θεοῦ, of God, denote the sole agent of the new-birth ; as the others, διὰ λόγου by the Word, and διὰ τοῦ ἐναγγελίου, by the Gospel, denote the sole instrument of the work. And if it be asked, why then is it said that we must be born ἐξ ὕδατος, of Water, if "the Word of Truth" be the sole, instead of only the more remote instrument of the work ? I reply ; because Water being the appointed symbol

of the Spirit's cleansing power, we are symbolically born ἐξ ὕδατος of Water, as we are really born ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, of the Spirit, or through His Agency. To say that Water, jointly with the Spirit, is really a source of the new-birth, because the same preposition is used of both, is to say, that Water is, not a more immediate instrument, but, with the Spirit, a joint Agent, of the birth ; or that we are born *of* Water in the same sense, in which we are born *of* the Spirit ; so that thus, according to the Theory of Baptismal regeneration here taught, the " new creature in Christ " is composed jointly of both Water and the Spirit. The truth is, that Water is neither an agent nor an instrument ; but it is the symbol of the real Agent's cleansing power ; and therefore the same preposition is used in speaking of it, as is used in speaking of that, of which it is the symbol.

In the passage, James, 1 : 18, " Of His own will begat He us with the Word of Truth," no preposition is used. It is what grammarians call ' the Dative of the instrument ; ' λόγῳ αληθείας. The passage, 1 Pet. 1 : 23, is exactly equivalent to this from James, 1 : 18. " Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but *of* incorruptible, *by* the word of the living God : " οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτης, διὰ λόγου ζώντος Θεοῦ ; the " Incorruptible Seed " referring to the Holy Spirit as the Sole Agent, and

“ the Word of the living God ” to divine Truth, as the sole Instrument.*

If we follow out what the Apostle says, James, 1 : 18, we shall see that he carries forward his meaning, when speaking of “ the Word of Truth ” as that, by which God hath begotten us again ; for he goes on to exhort those, whom he was addressing, to “ receive with meekness the ingrafted Word, which was able to save their souls.” v. 21. The figure here is changed, but not the sense. The Word ingrafted, the Truth implanted, by the Holy Spirit was the instrument of their new birth. Farther along, v. 23, the figure is again changed ; but still, the same sense remains, with this difference, that what is here said of the Word as “ a glass,” the mirror of a “ perfect law,” and of him that looketh into it as “ like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass,” has a broader application than the words in the 18th verse ; reaching not only to him, who, for the first time, looks into the mirror of the Word with a spiritual perception and belief of the Truth, but also to him, who, having entered the Way of life, “ continueth therein,” consulting often the same divine mirror, which first, through the Spirit, brought him to a knowledge of the Saviour ; and even extending to

* For the criticism, above referred to, see Tract 87, pp. 25, 26. N.Y.—Ed.

him, who, having the mirror of Truth, looks into it, and yet, "beholding himself, goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was." vs. 22-25. The whole passage shows us the true place and position of the Word of God, His Divine Truth, both in relation to Himself, who uses it as His sole instrument in our regeneration, and in relation to us, in whom it is made to do His blessed work.

Here, then, it will be asked ; ' If there be no such thing as an actual impartation to us of the very Divine nature, that awful mystery in Baptism ; or as the alleged gift involved in some one of the various modifications of this Theory ; and if the Spirit always performs His quickening and sanctifying work in the intelligent use of Divine Truth, and therefore always after the mind has become capable of understanding at least the simple and sovereign elements of that Truth :—then, what is left as the nature of Baptism ? What is Christ's design, and what the soul's experience, in this primary Christian ordinance ? To this Inquiry I am now, at last, ready to proceed, and to seek for such an answer as may be consonant with the intent and meaning of those Scriptures, which God has given us,—the richest treasury of all accessible divine knowledge.

I. In the first place, I invite attention to what I

must consider the false Canon of Interpretation, which has been applied to the text, John, 3 : 5, by way of furnishing a *Key* to unlock the meaning of other texts on the subject of Baptism. It has been said, that "The words of our Lord, 'birth *from above* of Water and the Spirit,' are a *Key* to other Scripture ; they are in themselves a high revelation, not to be closed up when we come to read other Scripture, and their fulness restrained within themselves, (as if, like the heretics of old, we looked upon different portions of Scripture as the work of another God) but flowing over into other parts and imparting to them the light, which they contain, concentrated within them."* Of certain early writers it is added, "not only did they understand these words, 'Water and the Spirit,' of Baptism, but they regarded them as a sort of *Key* to the rest of Holy Scripture, which any way bore on the same subjects."† "This was the general interpretation of the ancient Church ; those who quote the text of Baptism, go not about to prove its reference to it ; they *assume* it, *see* it."‡

In fashioning this *Key* and in using it, the mystery of Baptismal regeneration, as it has been stated, is first assumed ; and then this text is cited as a passage, which teaches that mystery ; and

* Tract 67, p. 44., N. Y. Ed. † Tr. 67, p. 31. ‡ Tr. 67, p. 46.

finally with the Key thus fashioned, the meaning of numerous other passages is unlocked, some of which allude to Baptism, while others of them carry no allusion whatever to that ordinance.

The same Canon of Interpretation, as I shall have occasion to show, is applied in settling the meaning of Scripture on the subject of the Lord's Supper. What Christ says in John, 6, of "eating His flesh and drinking ~~of~~ His blood," is assumed to be spoken of actually eating and drinking His flesh and blood in that Sacrament; and then, all other Scripture on the subject is forced to take, whether it will or not, the meaning thus arbitrarily assumed.

I have spoken of this Canon of Interpretation as false. A few words may be needed to shew in what its falsehood consists. I do not mean, then, that a single text may never be used as a key to the sense of other texts on the same subject. This is often admissible, and the key thus furnished is truly valuable. When a single text announces a doctrine, in itself reasonable and in its influence salutary, a doctrine neither absurd nor mischievous; and when it announces this doctrine in terms, about which there can be no difference of opinion, terms, which cannot be understood in more than one sense; then that text is a key to all others on the same subject, provided these others reasonably

admit of more than one sense, or of a sense harmonious with that of the key. If, indeed, these other texts themselves admit of but one sense, and this a flat contradiction to the meaning of the first, then the authority of the Bible is annihilated ; for two portions of that Book may never flatly contradict each other. For example : In Deut. 6 : 4, it is said, “יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד” literally ; “Jehovah our God is one Jehovah.” Now, whatever depth or variety of sense there may be in these words, beyond the line, or the scrutiny, of man’s understanding, there is *one* point of doctrine, which lies on the surface, and shines in unequivocal light ; and that is the doctrine of the *unity*, or *oneness*, of God. This one sense is good, agreeable to pure reason, vitally important, and divinely salutary. About this sense there is and can be no dispute. This, therefore, is a true key text ; and all others in the Bible on the same subject must be explained into harmony with this. When, therefore, we find many other texts in the Bible, which speak of this one Jehovah, as Father, as Son, and as Holy Ghost ; as these do not contradict the Key text, and as they too carry a sense, which is good and agreeable to pure reason, vitally important and divinely salutary ; they must be explained into harmony with that text ; as thus : In the *ONE* Jehovah are Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; and these,

being Three in person, are ONE in essence. The essential, indestructible, indivisible UNITY of Jehovah consists in a mysterious but blessed TRINITY of Persons. If, however, there were a single text in the Bible, which said, "Jehovah our God is Two, or THREE Jehovahs," it would destroy the authority of the whole, as an alleged Revelation ; it would make the Bible a flatly self-contradicting Book.

But, when a meaning is arbitrarily imposed on a text, which admits of a different sense, and may reasonably be understood otherwise ; especially, when the assumed meaning involves a doctrine, which is, if not manifestly false, yet practically pernicious, and if not absurd, yet loaded with heavy embarrassment ; and when, with the meaning thus fixed, men approach, as with the Key of Infallibility, to explain all other passages touching the same subject,—albeit these others reasonably admit of a different meaning ; expecting, the moment their Key is applied, they will fly open at its touch, and receive a flood of light into their previously locked-up darkness ; then, unquestionably, they adopt a false Canon of Interpretation ; and the common sense of the reflecting world turns Protestant against the violence thus done to all.

And yet, I venture to say that all this is done in explaining, or rather in imposing a sense on, the

text, John, 3:5. Whatever effort is made to give color to the meaning, put upon the passage, it amounts, after all, to a mere assumption of a meaning. Its advocates "go not about to *prove* its reference to Baptism; they *assume* it;" and they just as much assume the *meaning* which they find in it; and, having assumed that meaning, they proceed to force it upon all other texts on the subject of Baptism. The meaning itself, assumed, is thus expressed. Commenting on the words, "Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit," it is said: "This is our new birth, an *actual* birth of God, of Water and the Spirit, as we are actually born of our natural parents."* . . . "This regeneration is the being born of Water and the Spirit," or by God's Spirit again moving on the face of the waters, and sanctifying them for our cleansing, and cleansing us thereby."† "This birth from above is an *actual* birth from God, a gift coming down from God, and given to faith through Baptism; yet not the work of faith, but the operation of Water and the Holy Spirit; . . . the Holy Spirit giving us a new life in the fountain opened by Him; and we being born therein *of* Him, even as our blessed and Incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb: . . . the gift of

* Tract 67, p. 24.

† Tract 67, pp. 47, 48.

God, illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery, from which it flows, the Incarnation of our Redeemer."†

Such being the meaning put on the text, the principal reasons assigned for it are two ; 1, that it is therein said we must be born *ἄνωθεν* ; "from above," and "of Water and the Spirit," as in our ordinary birth we are born *of* our natural parents ; and 2, that such is the meaning put upon the passage by a long catalogue of ancient writers, and Liturgies.§

The former of these reasons involves a simply naked assumption. The very thing to be ascertained is, what is the meaning of the expressions, "born again," *ἄνωθεν* ; and "born of Water and the Spirit?" To say that they carry the meaning assigned them, is but to *assume* a meaning without reason.—*ἄνωθεν*, it is true, has often the sense of *desuper*, "from above," but it has sometimes the sense of *denuó*, "anew," or a "second time ;" and this latter was the sense in which Nicodemus understood the word. He supposed our Saviour's language to imply that a man must "enter, *ἄνωθεν*, a *second time* into his mother's womb and be born." It is true that, on the whole, he failed to apprehend the real point of Christ's teaching ; yet his

† Tr. 67, p. 43.

§ Tr. 67, p. 24–48, *passim*.

misapprehension would not seem to have been total. The Birth, of which Christ spake, is *ἄνωθεν*; supernal, in the sense of its being a work of the Spirit: but, in His use of the word, Christ doubtless included the sense of its being a *second* birth. The phrase, "of Water and the Spirit," is an exegesis of *ἄνωθεν*; but, both the word itself and its exegesis embody the two ideas of a *second* birth and a *spiritual* birth; so that Nicodemus was not wholly wrong in supposing that, by *ἄνωθεν* Christ meant *denuó*, "again," and not *desuper*, from "above." He was right in part, but in a greater part wrong. It is not, however, in the sense put upon *ἄνωθεν*, that the assumption chiefly lies. It lies in the sense imposed on the phrase, "born of water and the Spirit," as exegetical of that word.

The second reason for the meaning, thus assumed, simply shows that this meaning has actually been given to the passage; and that it has the authority of many and grave names; but it does not show that this is necessarily the true sense. No real Christian denies that we must be "born of Water and the Spirit;" on the contrary, every such Christian knows, by a happy experience, that this new-birth is a divine fact of the deepest importance. Nor are any fair interpreters disposed to deny that the "birth of *Water*," spoken of in the passage, means *Baptism*. But, many, the authority of

whose names is as weighty as that of any, since the times of the Apostles, do deny that the expression, "born of Water and the Spirit," bears the meaning here assumed for it. They deny, too, that the *effect*, which this meaning involves, follows Baptism as its *cause*, or *source*. These are the very questions to be determined. If, therefore, the meaning "*assumed*" for this expression, and "*seen*" in it, though not "*proved*" of it, be a *wrong* meaning, it matters not how many writers, or how many Liturgies are concerned in assuming and seeing what they attempt not to "prove," for there have been ages, not very modern, when both individual writers, and even Church Liturgies were prone to incorporate many serious *errors* with the body of truths, which they held ; and to make those errors more obtrusive and more operative than those truths themselves. Under such circumstances, a *wrong* meaning of a text, though assumed and seen ten thousand times, does not thereby become a *right* meaning.

Notwithstanding, then, the reasons alleged for the meaning assigned to the text in question, it is, in fact, an arbitrarily assumed meaning. Abstractly it might be a right, or it might be a wrong meaning ; but practically, whether it be right or wrong, is the very question to be decided ; it must be decided according to just laws of interpretation ; and these

laws oblige us to look at any meaning proposed before we adopt it as the true.

Let us, then, look once more at the meaning proposed in the present case. It comes briefly to this : that in Baptism, the Infant is born *of* "sanctifying water" and "*of* the Holy Ghost," even as Christ was conceived in the womb of the Virgin and born of the Divine Spirit, deriving His Humanity through the former, and His Divinity from the latter ; insomuch that, by an illimitable and incomprehensible mystery, the baptized becomes "a partaker of the Incarnation ;" deriving a sanctified human nature from that "womb" of waters, and a portion of the Divine nature from that "miracle" of the Holy One. Now, this, it is fearlessly asserted, is neither a reasonable, nor a salutary sense of the words of Christ. The reason, which God has given to every man, and the History, which God has written on every age, justify the assertion. It is a sense, which burdens the Scriptures with an intolerable load of difficulties, and, at the same time, nourishes a mischievously superstitious regard for, and use of both the Christian ordinances. It is not a necessary sense of the words, nor the only sense which they will bear, nor an actually undisputed sense, nor a sense, which resistlessly shuts out another and a better meaning. Fearlessly, therefore, is it still further asserted, that the process,

by which this sense is reached, involves a false Canon of Interpretation. It forces on a text, which may have another and a better meaning, a sense, which, as I shall have occasion to show, carries in it the seed of that monster-absurdity and impossibility—Transubstantiation; and then boldly claims, that the sense, thus assumed, shall be received, as an Infallible Key for opening the meaning of all other texts on the subject of Baptism. Nothing more is needed to show that such a process of interpretation is fundamentally wrong; and that if, in any case, it ever reach the truth, it must be by accident, and not by following a safe and luminous guide.

The true Canon of Interpretation for settling the meaning of a disputed text, which, for the very reason that it *is* disputed, must admit of another sense than any arbitrarily assumed for it, is the direct opposite of that just exposed. This Rule requires us, first, to “search the Scriptures” for the analogy of faith, or doctrine, on the subject involved in the disputed text; and then, by this analogy, to explain the passage in dispute. In all cases, where the sense of a particular passage is doubtful, it is certainly right that the particular passage should yield to the general analogy of Scripture, and as certainly wrong that the whole analogy of Scripture should be forced to yield to an assumed sense of the particular passage.

I have, then, already shown, at some length, that the meaning, which we have seen imposed on John, 3 : 5, is part of a great system of Theology, which necessarily pushes itself back to the fall of man, in search of an Idea of original righteousness and original sin, wholly unknown, and clearly opposed, both to the teachings of the Bible and to the language of our Articles ; and that, therefore, we are not only justified in rejecting, but bound to reject, not only that false notion of original righteousness and original sin, but also its inseparably associated error, of Baptismal regeneration itself. As consistent Theologians, we are not at liberty, to reject that false notion of original righteousness and original sin, and yet to retain this twin-born Theory of Baptismal Regeneration. If we can not hold the former, we may not cling to the latter. The texts, which relate to Baptism, not only may, but must, be interpreted into harmony with that other great system of Theology, which necessarily comes in as antagonist with that, which we have rejected.

Through a somewhat extended examination of texts, which have, or are alleged to have, a connection with the subject of Baptism, I have already passed. In applying the true Canon of Interpretation, just now stated, I proceed to an examination of other texts on the same subject, upon which the

Theory of Baptismal Regeneration places its main reliance. I will examine, first, all the other passages, which are of any importance to the discussion; and then, finally, proceed to a fuller examination of what has been termed the Key text of the subject, John, 3 : 5.

II. 1. I begin with Matt. 3 : 13-16; the passage, which gives an account of the Baptism of Christ; and I begin with this, because our Church, in her Baptismal office, says that God, "by the Baptism of His well-beloved Son in the river Jordan, did sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin;" and because of the peculiar view, which the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration take of this language, and of the Baptism of Christ, as the Institutor of the ordinance, into the nature of which we are inquiring.

By the language of our Baptismal office, then,— "did sanctify Water to the mystical washing away of sin"—I understand, according to the uniform sense of the word "sanctify," when applied to external things, "did separate and set apart water to be a sign and seal of the forgiveness of sins on the terms of the Gospel, and a symbol of purification from sin by the influences of the Spirit." The advocates, however, of the Theory of Baptismal regeneration, as here understood, give a very different significancy to these words of our Ritual,

and a very different effect to the baptism of Christ, on which they are founded. These writers suggest that the design of Christ's Baptism may have been—"to fulfill all righteousness . . . by cleansing the sinful nature, in the likeness of which He had come; and to impart to it, as a whole, the Righteousness, which He should afterward communicate, one by one, to those, who came to the Baptism, which He had thus consecrated;" and they say that the early Christians "doubted not that the very element had, by its contact with Him, in this His condescension, received a degree of sanctity and fitness to be a vehicle of Spiritual gifts;" and that "His Baptism received the gifts, which were bestowed upon ours, and was to us the pledge and first channel of those gifts."*

Now, all this is mere Theory; a Theory which one has a right to construct, if he choose; but still, mere Theory. Having fashioned their Idea of the "*opus operatum*" in Baptism, of the gift of the Holy Spirit in the water, and of the mystery of our incorporation into the Body of the Incarnate Son; it is quite easy for them to impose that Idea, by way of *addition*, upon any text, that mentions Baptism;—but, to add a sense to a text is not to find a sense in a text; and this were enough to say,

* Tract 67, p. 221, 224, 225.

even if the sense added were intelligible and good ; and more than is needed when that sense is neither the one nor the other. What may be meant by the Baptism of Christ "cleansing that sinful nature in the (sinless) likeness of which He had come ;" or what by His Baptism "imparting to our nature as a whole"—or, in its abstract Idea—"that righteousness which He should afterward communicate, one by one,"—the concrete nature of each individual—"to those who came to the Baptism which He had thus consecrated ;" or what by "the very element" of water, water in the abstract, or water always and every where, "receiving a degree of sanctity and fitness to become a vehicle of Spiritual gifts," because a little portion of the Jordan once came in "contact with Him ;" it is, I confess, difficult to conceive ; although it is not difficult to see that the sense, so darkly shadowed forth, must minister to mischievous superstition in using the sensible things of religion. This sense may minister to a deep and trembling awe in view of a supposed "overwhelming mystery," but it cannot impart to Baptism the efficacy, which it ascribes ; nor can it keep multitudes of those, who have been baptized in Infancy, from thinking themselves somehow safe, though living in open worldliness and even in open sin. It is enough to say of it, that it is a sense not found in the Evangelist's account of the Baptism of Christ,

nor in the language of our ritual when speaking of that Baptism. What that Baptism was, I leave to be seen in the simple phrase in which the Bible expresses it.

2. John, 1 : 12, 13. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons-of God, to them that believe on His name ; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

This passage deserves notice, not because it has any thing to do with Baptism, but because a reference in it to the subject of baptism is distinctly assumed by the advocates of Baptismal regeneration.* Because it is said that they who "received" Christ, that is, "believed on His name," were "born of God," it is assumed that they were thus born in and of the Water of Baptism, by the Spirit ; and that this birth consisted in an impartation of the Divine substance, or nature, in and of that Water and the Spirit. Upon this I remark, in the first place, that, if it had any force it would make against Infant Baptism : for, in the Evangelist, the birth is predicated of those only, who "believed" in Christ ; and Infants cannot so believe. In the second place, however, the meaning given to the phrase, "born of God," is again mere assumption.

* Tract 67, p. 31, N. Y. ed.

There is no reason for supposing that Baptism is here referred to at all ; or that, if Baptism were understood, it is referred to as, jointly with the Spirit, the source of the miraculous birth declared. The Evangelist had just been speaking of the rejection of Christ by " His own countrymen," *οἱ ἰδιῶται*, through their unbelief ; they " received Him not,"—that is, " believed " not on Him. To these, he immediately opposes those " who received Him by believing on His name." These, he says, " were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man ;" the work was of no human agency, " but of God ;" and to these, he adds, Christ " gave power," or the privilege, " to become the Sons of God." All this certainly does prove that the new birth, one of the principal steps in which I have all along observed to be *faith*, is a Divine work, wrought by the sole agency of the Spirit of God ; but, to assume that this work is wrought in Baptism, and that it is the birth *of* Water, as jointly with the Spirit, its *source*, is but to force a sense upon Scripture, whether it will take that sense or not. It is, after all, but seeking to give strength to a human theory by the prop of mere human weakness. The passage is heavy with importance ; but its import weighs wholly against the Theory, into a support of which it is pressed. It shews that the birth from God involves the exercise of *faith* in its

subject ; and that the Bible speaks of it here, as in many other places it is, in fact, in the *habit* of speaking of it, without any reference to Baptism.

3. 1 Cor. 12 : 13. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." At first sight, this passage seems to teach that, in Baptism, the Holy Spirit brings us into spiritual union with Christ ; but, on closer examination, this may prove a groundless inference. There is nothing in the context to shew that baptism by *water* is here intended ; on the contrary, there is much to prove that the passage refers to that inward Baptism of the Spirit through the Truth, of which *water* is the divinely appointed, sacramental *symbol*.

That there is a baptism *without* water can not be denied. "I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance," said the herald John ; "but He that cometh after me . . . shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire : " Matt. 3 : 11. To pause, a moment, on this language : the phrase, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with *fire*," throws light on the meaning of that other phrase, "born of *Water* and the Spirit." The "*divided tongues* as of fire," which marked the baptism with the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, Acts, 2 : 3, fulfilling thus the words of the Baptist, Matt. 3 : 11, were a symbol of the Spirit's gifts in endowing the Twelve with the miraculous power of

speaking *divers languages*. To be baptized “with *fire*,” then, was to receive a *symbol* of one class of the Spirit’s influences, viz: the extraordinary and miraculous. To be baptized “with *water*,” therefore, is to receive a *symbol* of another class of the Spirit’s influences, viz: the ordinary and unmiraculous. If it be urged, that, because the extraordinary Pentecostal gift *accompanied* its symbol, therefore the ordinary grace must also *accompany* its symbol, I answer; this does not follow; for it is essential to the proof of a *miracle*, as in the gift of tongues, that the sign, if there be one, which evidences it to *be* a miracle, should accompany that, of which it *is* an evidence; but no such necessity ties the symbol of Water to the ordinary, *unmiraculous* grace of the Spirit, which it symbolizes. Or, if men will insist that Baptism is a “*miracle*,” in the sense, in which the marvel of the Pentecost was a miracle, then let them show, as in all other miracles, that the miraculous *effect* is inseparable from the symbol, which accompanies it, and that the miracle and its symbol are always *simultaneous*.

But—to return to the thought;—there is a Baptism *without* water. “I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance; but He that cometh after me . . . shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” This prophecy of John was *literally*

fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost, when *fire*, not water, was the symbol of the marvel, which the Spirit wrought: and the same prophecy is *substantially* fulfilled, when the same Divine Agent brings the Soul, by repentance and faith, to Christ and to newness of heart and life in Him. This inward work on the Soul, this work of power and love, of quickening, life-warm energy, of transforming, yet ordinary grace, is called a baptism because the baptism by Water is its appointed symbol. This inward cleansing, whenever effected by the Spirit through the Truth, that holy light, which is shed upon the mind, is, with beauty and force, called a *Baptism*. Such figurative use of the word has been carried even further than this, by the highest authority,—that of the Divine Saviour Himself: “I have a Baptism to be baptized with,” was His language in View of His bloody Sweat and bloodier Cross. Luke, 12 : 50. “Are ye able to be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with?” Matt. 20 : 22, was His inquiry of the disciples, whose ambitious mother would have them to be distinguished in their Master’s kingdom; little dreaming that martyrdom would be the *first* bright crown, awarded to the *foremost* subjects of such a king.

With our minds, then, familiar with this beautifully and forcibly figurative use of the word, Bap-

tism, let us now look at the passage just cited from 1 Cor. 12 : 13. It occurs in the Apostle's discourse on the subject of that essential, intimate, spiritual union, which exists between *all* Christians, whether "Jew or Gentile, bond or free," and Christ their Divine Head ; a union which always characterizes the true spiritual Body of Christ, as a "Communion of Saints," and which, therefore, ought always to characterize His visible Body, as a communion of professed disciples. Speaking of the various gifts, by which this visible Body was then distinguished, by way of preparing for that most divine discourse, which follows in the next chapter, about "Charity," or holy love, as that very "bond of perfection," which is to tie the members of Christ in Heaven, when faith and hope shall have gone out in sight and fruition, the Apostle says ; using one of his customarily striking figures ; "for, as the (human) body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one Body, being many, are one Body, so also is Christ. For, by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free ; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit."

Now, it is obvious that the whole of this is *figurative* speech ; that is, the literal human body, animated by the living human soul, is used as a figure of the Church, as "the mystical Body" of

Christ, animated by that Holy Spirit, which cements all its members into indissoluble union. Hence, the baptism, spoken of, is that inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost, which has its appointed symbol, indeed, in the Baptism by *Water*, but which, as we have seen, is so often spoken of without any reference to that Symbol. The true force of the passage may be thus given in paraphrase. "By one Divine Spirit all real Christians, of whatever name or nation, Jew or Gentile, bond or free, are closely united as members of that one Spiritual Body, of which Christ is Head; and this work may be called a *Baptism*, because it has its appointed Symbol in that primary Christian ordinance." The whole passage is so incontestibly a strong, bold figure of speech, that it would be as great violence to language to quote it as explanatory of literal Infant Baptism, as it would be to quote what Christ said of His then coming and bloody Baptism of suffering, as if it had been spoken to explain His past literal Baptism of Water in the Jordan. Even, however, if we were to admit so great an absurdity as that the *literal* Baptism could have been intended in the very heart of an encompassing *figure*, it would still remain for inquiry, What is the actual work of the Spirit in relation to that literal Baptism? To this Inquiry, however, I am not yet ready to attend.

For the present, I proceed with this examination of passages.

4. Eph. 5 : 25-32. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water by the Word ; *ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθάριας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι*. that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing ; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. (He that loveth his wife loveth himself.) For no man ever yet hated his own flesh ; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. For we are members of His Body, of His flesh and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife ; and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery : but I speak concerning Christ and the Church."

On this passage great stress is laid by the writers on Baptismal Regeneration. Thus, one of them observes : "As it is a melancholy mark of our times, that a portion of 'the world' has already begun to shrink from this comparison between the relations of marriage and those of Christ to His Church, so it is, undoubtedly, not unconnected with

it, but a part of the same state of feeling, which depreciates Baptism thus connected by St. Paul with it.”* After this, he endeavors to show, and cites various post-Nicene writers as favoring his views, that Baptism is that mysterious fountain of cleansing and sanctification to the Church, from which she is, *at once*, presented to Christ, “wholly cleansed ;” that, however there may be an “ulterior purity,” to which the Church, “in her triumphant state,” is to be advanced, still, “the end of the cleansing,” or the design of Baptism, “is, that she might abide, sanctified, spotless, unblemished ;” being, in this Sacrament, “once wholly cleansed ;”† and that the Instrumentality of “THE WORD,” as mentioned in this passage, is immediately connected with “the washing of Water ;” “THE WORD” being the power of Christ in the Baptismal *formula*, and not in the teachings of the Bible written and preached.‡

But what a violence upon language is all this ! The whole force of the first part of this passage may be thus expressed : “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that, having emblematically cleansed it by the washing of Water, He might really and progressively sanctify it by the Word ; and that,

* Tract 67, p. 152.

† Tract 67, pp. 154, 155.

‡ Tract 67, p. 160.

thus, in its future, glorified state, He might at last present it to Himself spotless and unwrinkled, holy and without blemish." The analogy of other Scripture, on the subject of this *future* presentation of the Saints in spotlessness and glory, shows that this is the Apostle's meaning in the present passage:—see, particularly, 2 Cor. 11 : 2 ; Col. 1 : 21–23 ; and Jude, vs. 24 ; also, Rev. 21, *passim*, especially vs. 27.—In this passage from Eph. 5, there is not the shadow of a hint about Christ's presenting the Church to Himself upon EARTH spotless from the bath of Baptism. Besides, the instrumentality which the Apostle here assigns to "the word," is the same, evidently, with that, which Christ Himself assigns to it, John 17 : 17 ; "Sanctify them through Thy Truth : Thy Word is Truth." The difference between *ῥῆμα*, in Eph. 5 : 26 ; and *λόγος*, in John 17 : 17 is unessential to the present examination. The washing of Water in Eph. 5 : 26, is evidently referred to as the baptismal emblem of what Christ really effects by His Spirit through the instrumentality of His Word. The passage, more literally rendered, reads thus : "that, having cleansed by the washing of Water, He might sanctify it by the Word :"
*ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ, καθάρισα^ς τῷ
 λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἐν ῥήματι.* The really instrumental character of the Word is indicated by the use of a preposition, *ἐν ῥήματι* ; while the emblematical cleans-

ing with water is expressed without any preposition ; ὡς λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ; “with the washing of water” emblematically representing , “*by* the Word” instrumentally effecting , the divinely-cleansing process. This distinction may be still further indicated by the difference of words used in describing the two different processes : καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ; ἁγιάσθη-εν ῥήματι. Καθαρίζω is used, properly, of *external* cleansings, as of the washing of the body in water. Ἀγιάζω is used of *internal* purifyings, as of sanctifying the *soul* by the Spirit through the Truth. So far as Infants are concerned, Baptism *by water* first symbolizes, and then in riper years the Spirit by *the Word* effects, carries forward and finally perfects, the inward sanctification of the soul ; and thus, each individual being made progressively holy, the whole Church, as one Body, shall at last, in her glorified state, be presented by Christ to Himself, as His spotless and divinely adorned BRIDE, to spend with Him an eternity of perfect and honored blessedness. This *futurity* of the Church’s spotlessness will become more evident by studying the verses, which immediately follow.

“So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies : (He that loveth his wife loveth himself :) for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord, the

Church. For we are members of His Body, of His flesh and of His bones. 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife; and they two shall be one flesh.' This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and his Church." Let us study these verses awhile.

In the Tract on Baptism, so often referred to, the writer, explaining Eph. 5 : 22-27, adds in a foot note the following, among other remarks, in reference to these verses; 28-32. "The words belong to human marriage as a type;—but, as to the Anti-type, they designate that, which marriage also designates; the relation of Christ to His Church. Marriage is a mystery, as shadowing out that union, as having been, in the first instance, a hidden prophecy of it, and now being an image and reflection of it. . . . Marriage is a *mystery*, in *portraying* the union of the Church with Christ, is not a *Sacrament*, as not *conveying* it.* In other words, according to this Theory, the Sacraments *do* convey union with Christ. Marriage does not convey this union; and *therefore* is not a Sacrament. What this author means by union with Christ we have already seen. He means, "participation in the Incarnation;" or, as he says when treating of the Lord's

* Tract 67, p. 154.

Supper ; the flesh and blood of Christ “commingled and co-united with the bodies and souls” of Christians, “and preserving both for incorruption.”* Had he been speaking of the preservation of natural flesh from corruption, by the intermixture with it of what is antiseptic, he could not have used stronger terms. This union, then, is held to be conveyed and sustained by the Sacraments, and by them only. Hence, this author speaks of them as “the means whereby Christ originally unites the Church to Himself, or still nourishes, and cherishes, and maintains her in that union.”† Hence he quotes Chrysostom, as saying : “In Baptism we are incorporated into Christ, and made flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone.”‡ And hence he says, “The partaking of the Incarnation . . . is imparted through Baptism, and is not imparted without it.”§ These quotations make it easy to gather the interpretation, which the writer suggests, but does not develop, of the verses, Eph. 5 : 28–32. In conformity with his Explication of the preceding verses, 25–27, it would run thus : “Marriage is a type of the union between the Church and Christ.” As therefore, by the mystery of marriage, “the twain become one flesh,” so, by

* Sermons on the Lord's Supper, p. 9, N. Y.

† Tract 67, p. 216.

‡ Tract 67, p. 159.

§ Tract 67, p. 31.

the mystery of Baptism, the Church and Christ become one flesh ; each individual member being made therein " a partaker of the Incarnation," and all, by the " commingling and co-uniting of His flesh and blood with their bodies and souls," being made members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones." Marriage is the shadow ;—the substance lies in this " great mystery . . . concerning Christ and the Church."

But, does Eph. 5 : 28-32 really teach such a union as this between the Church and Christ? A careful examination will show that it does not.

It is no more than reasonable, then, that we should judge of the nature of that relation, of which marriage is a Type, by looking at the nature of that relation, which is constituted in marriage itself. In the language of the Homilies, " If Sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things, whereof they be Sacraments, they could be no Sacraments at all."* The same is true of Types. If they have not a certain similitude of those things whereof they are Types, they are no Types at all. What, then, is the similitude between marriage as a Type, and the union of the Church with Christ, as the antitype? A brief answer to this question will serve to throw light on a point, which

* Hom. of Common Prayer and Sacraments.

certain writers are fond of wrapping in the darkness of profound mystery.

The relation, then, between husband and wife is that of a union based on COVENANT, on a mutual engagement of fidelity each to the other. The first transpiring of this mutual contract, the first publication of it, is called the Betrothal, or Espousals. Its final solemnization, according to constituted form, is termed the Marriage. And those, who enter into this state, are regarded, by the Word of God as ONE, even before the act of marriage itself; that is, as united in a covenant, which supposes common sympathies, creates a common interest, and, if religiously understood and fulfilled, looks forward to a common destiny. Behold, here, the similitude of the Type to the Antitype; of marriage to the union between the Church and Christ! This latter relation, too, is that of a union, based on COVENANT; on a mutual engagement to fidelity between the contracting parties. This sacred union hath its day of betrothal, or espousals, in the present life. The marriage, to which it looks forward, is to be celebrated in solemn and royal state, on the morning of the great Day of days. And the parties, who here enter into this holy State of Covenant, are regarded, by the Bible, as already ONE; that is, as united in a bond, which supposes a common, or mutual love, creates a com-

mon interest, and looks forward to a common destiny. Let us see how this matter lies on the Record.

The "Covenant" relation between the Lord and His Church, under the Old Dispensation, is termed a "marriage;" Ezek. 16 : 8, and Jer. 3 : 14. In His character as "Maker and Redeemer," the Lord styles Himself the "Husband" of His ancient people. Isa. 54 : 5. The time, when He entered into Covenant with that people in particular, is called the time of their "Espousals." Jer. 2 : 2. Moreover, the Covenant, which then united the Church to her Head, was the same with that which still unites them. The only difference is, that it has passed under a new and better Dispensation, under which Christ, the way of Salvation through Him, and the nature and extent of His promises, are more fully revealed; thus more distinctly "bringing Life and Immortality to light." And, furthermore, this Divine relation, this Holy union, here based on Covenant signed and sealed, is to be brought forth for final and glorious solemnization on the illustrious morning of the Resurrection. Hence, the Apostle Paul, evidently referring forward to that great Day, says to the Corinthians: "I have espoused you to one Husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." 2 Cor. 11 : 2 literally, "I have espoused you to one Hus-

band to present a chaste Virgin to Christ." To the Corinthians, as individuals, or as a little band, "the espousals" were *past*: the presentation of the "chaste Virgin" was yet *to come*, when the heavenly Bride, having grown to perfect stature and put on her countless jewels of souls redeemed and glorified, should stand up at the altar in Heaven to own Her covenant Lord. Hence, John, in the visions of the Apocalypse, when he "heard a great voice of much people in heaven," caught, among others, these words: "The marriage of the Lamb is come; and His Wife hath made herself ready." Rev. 19:7. And hence, "The New Jerusalem," or Church in Heaven, is styled "the Bride, the Lamb's Wife." Rev. 21:9.

Bringing the light thus gathered to shine on Eph. 5:28-32, it is evident that that passage may be freely paraphrased, thus: "Under the Covenant of grace, Christians are members of Christ's Body, the Church, and so may be termed His flesh and His bones. In this holy union Christ loves the Church; and nourisheth and cherisheth it, as His now graciously espoused, and hereafter to be royally affianced and glorified Bride. Of this Divine Union, the sacred relation of husband and wife is a kind of type or symbol, and was so ordained from the beginning. Husbands, therefore, are religiously bound to love their wives as their

own selves, (he that loveth his wife does in fact love himself, since the Covenant between them makes them in so many important respects ONE); for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord loveth and cherisheth the Church. So let husbands love and cherish their wives; for it is written on the first pages of Revelation, "For this cause," or on account of the significance of marriage, as a type of Christ's covenant relation to the Church, "a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and they shall be one flesh." Gen. 2 : 24. This is a great mystery; but I speak it of Christ and the Church. Marriage, as a covenant relation, is significant as well as sacred; it is designed to be auxiliary to this higher covenant; and therefore it should be hallowed by the same holy love, which this higher covenant demands."

It must be remembered that the Apostle's leading subject, here, was not Christ and the Church, but husband and wife; and his teaching amounts plainly to this; that marriage is a divine Institution. It is the basis of the family-relation. The family itself is a divine arrangement, designed to be preparatory to the Church. Every truly religious family is a little Church. Its office is, to train up God's children for *individual* membership

in His *greater* Church on earth ; even as the office of this greater is, to train them more perfectly for their *collective* character as the *Bride*, the Church in Heaven ; that Church which is, on the morning of the great Day, to be presented to Christ arrayed in divinely effulgent glories for the enjoyment with Him of eternal blessedness and spotless honor. Every husband, therefore, ought to love his wife with that pure and tender love, which beginning *here*, in the family and Church on earth, is to grow to its perfection in the family on *high* and the Church in *heaven*.

Such is the "great mystery" and the *whole* mystery of marriage, as related to Christ and the Church. The Sacraments are to the Church what the Ring is to matrimony. They are two golden and holy marriage Rings, signs of the *pure* union, and pledges of the *endless* love, between her members and her Head. This union itself is, like marriage, a covenant relation ; and it no more makes Christians one with Christ in the sense of being "partakers of His Incarnation," of His *literally* incarnate flesh and Divinity, than marriage makes the husband and wife *literally* one flesh and soul. By covenant, husband and wife are ONE. In person they continue two. The phrase, "we are members of His Body, of His flesh and of His bones," means ; We are members of His Church, or "mystical

Body ;” and, as every *natural* body has flesh and bones, so carrying out the strong figure, Christians, as members of that mystical Body, may be called “His flesh and His bones.” The language of the Apostle, understood as some authors are fond of understanding it, would make Christians members of Christ in a double, or rather tripple sense ; members of His *body*, members of His flesh, and members of His bones. His words import no more than this : that, adopting the lively phraseology of figure, individual Christians may be called “the flesh and bones of that Body” of Christ, which is the Church. In truth, the Apostle’s words indicate this sense : ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. The latter part of the sentence is evidently explicatory of the former ; and the whole may be rendered thus : “for we are members of His body, that is, parts of His flesh and of His bones :” the Body being taken as the whole of the Church, and the preposition, ἐκ showing that the flesh and bones are to be taken distributively, as parts of that whole.

The whole passage, then, Eph. 5 : 25–32, makes nothing in favor of the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, in the sense maintained by its leading advocates ; but it is replete and luminous with teachings of a very different character. It makes “the Washing of Water,” as in Ezek. 36 : 25–27,

and in Isa. 44 : 3, the *emblem*, and "the word of Truth," as in 1 Pet. 1 : 23 ; and in James 1 : 18, the *Instrument*, of that regenerating and sanctifying work, which, realized here in every Christian, shows how "the Bride, the Lamb's wife," is now "making herself ready" for that future august occasion, on which Christ is to "present her to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing ; but holy" at last "and without blemish." And it shows the momentous relation, which, in the Divine intention, marriage has to all this, as an Institution designed to minister to the whole heavenly result ; and therefore binding to all that holiness of affection, which this result is eternally to unfold.

5.—1 Pet. 3 : 21. "The like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

This was written immediately after the Apostle's reference to Noah and the persons saved with him in the Ark ; and external Baptism with water is undoubtedly the idea which he intended to illustrate. It is a passage of some difficulty, and its precise meaning is not easily settled. Nevertheless its principal sense is, I think, apparent. It does not mean that the waters of the flood were

themselves a Type of the waters of Baptism. This would be a most incongruous meaning. The waters of the flood were not saving, but destroying. They could not, therefore, typify even the symbol of our salvation; much less the work of our salvation itself. The idea is, that the whole circumstance of Noah's being saved from temporal death by passing in the Ark, *δι' ὕδατος*. "through the water," is a type of what Baptism, rightly understood, does for us "through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ." Nor, again, does the passage mean that what is thus effected for us by Baptism is effected by the *water* in that ordinance. Against such a supposition the Apostle expressly guards when he says that the thing in Baptism, to which he refers, is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." In other words, it is something in Baptism rightly understood; not the *water* in Baptism, but that inward work of the Spirit, which Baptism symbolizes, and which enables us, in all good sincerity and honesty of conscience before God, to answer the questions propounded at Baptism. And finally, it may, I think, be made evident that the something, from which Baptism, thus rightly understood, saves us, is, not the present deep pollution and the future fearful punishment of our sins, but the present afflicting terror and the future abiding dominion, of that

same *temporal* death, from which Noah was saved in the Ark. This is rendered highly probable by the addition, which the Apostle makes, when he says that this inward significancy of Baptism saves us "by," or through, "the Resurrection of Jesus Christ;" that is, as Jesus Christ rose from the dead on the third day, so the *faith* in Him, which is professed and sealed in Baptism, when, with "a good conscience toward God." we answer "the questioning," ἐπερώτημα, which is then made, assures us that *we* also shall rise from the dead at the last Day, and thus, that death shall hold over us but a brief dominion.

This interpretation is strongly confirmed by two other passages. The one of these is Rom. 6 : 8, 9. "Now if we be *dead* with Christ, we *believe* that we shall also *live* with Him: knowing that Christ, being *raised* from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more *dominion* over Him." This was spoken after what the Apostle had said about being "*baptized* into Jesus Christ," and about being "*buried* with Him by Baptism into death." Without anticipating what I shall have to say about these expressions, I may remark that their connection with the 8th and 9th verses makes it evident that the sense of the verses may be thus given: "If, as we *profess* at adult Baptism, or as Infant Baptism signifies we *should* become, we be really "dead with

Christ,"—truly penitent for sin, thoroughly determined to renounce it, and inwardly *deadened* to its power,—“we *believe* we shall also *live* with Him,” shall continue to cherish, cultivate and enjoy that *spiritual* life, which our repentance and faith imply, or to which Infant Baptism binds us ; and not only so, but shall also *rise*, like Christ, from the dead and live with Him forever. As “death hath no more dominion over *Him*,” so shall it have no more over *us*, either in the tyranny of sin in this life. or in the abiding power of the grave over us when this life shall have ended.” It is probable that, at Baptism, the early converts to Christ professed their *faith* in the great doctrine of the Resurrection of the body, based on the FACT of the Resurrection of Christ.

The other passage is 1 Cor. 15 : 29–30. “Else what shall they do, who are *baptized* for the *dead*, if the dead rise not at all ? Why are they then baptized for the dead ? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour ?” This has been thought one of the most difficult passages in the New Testament. It occurs in the Apostle’s argument for the resurrection of the *Body*, and it has given rise to various interpretations ; but the best criticisms and helps, to which I have had access, render it highly probable. if not quite certain, that its sense is simply this : “If our dead bodies are not to rise at

all, then why, at Baptism, do we profess our *belief* in their resurrection from the dead, based on the **FACT** of the Resurrection of Christ? Why are we baptized in the belief of such a Resurrection from the dead? And why, through *constancy* in this faith, do we, every hour, jeopard our lives amid the persecutions, which this constancy brings upon us?"—This sense agrees with the whole scope of the Apostle's argument in that noble chapter, and it goes far to render certain the position that, originally, one of the things, professed at the Baptism of the early Christians, was, their steadfast faith in the Resurrection of the *Body*, grounded on the *fact* of Christ's own Resurrection. This was the fact, which all the Apostles, though none of them so emphatically as Paul, most vigorously asserted and testified. It was their unswerving testimony to this fact, which brought on them the persecuting hate of the Jews; and it was their preaching of this fact, with the truth which it involved, of the possibility and certainty of the resurrection of the human body, that provoked against them the burning scorn of the Greek. Acts, 17 : 18, 32. Doubtless, therefore, it was this *fact itself*, and the faith which it supported in the future resurrection of their own bodies, which the first Christians at their Baptism professed, and most steadfastly persevered in professing in the face of all the peril, in which it involved them.

And now, let us bring the light of these two passages, and spread it over that, which I am explaining from 1 Pet. 3 : 21. I think it plainly manifests the following meaning : "That Baptism, which is the antitype—*ἀντίτυπον*—of Noah's being saved in the Ark from temporal death amid the devouring waters of Deluge, or, as our Service expresses it, "from perishing by Water ;"—that Baptism, which consists—not in the mere "putting away of the filth of the flesh," as though the *water* were a principal thing, but—in "the answer of a good conscience toward God" to the customary "questioning" of our faith in the Resurrection,—*that* Baptism, *thus* understood, assures us that *we* also shall be saved from the future dominion of the grave as certainly as Christ was *raised* up from the power of the Sepulchre." Or, in the light, which one Apostle reflects from Christ upon a brother Apostle, 1 Pet. 3 : 21 may thus, with strict justice to the original, be more closely paraphrased : "Noah and his family were carried in the Ark through the destroying waters of the Flood, and thus saved from present temporal death. The "*Antitype*" to this,—I mean Baptism,—not, however, the mere "putting away of the filth of the flesh," but what this material washing signifies, in "the answer of a good conscience toward God," given as the result of the inward baptism of the

Holy Ghost, "now saves *us*" also ; or assures us, as God's pledge, that our bodies shall hereafter be raised from the grave, "through the resurrection of Jesus Christ," or by the same power, which "raised Him from the dead."

This passage, therefore, furnishes no support to the Idea, that Baptism is the fountain and "source" of that new life which saves us from the indwelling corruptions of sin ; and that, in Baptism, is wrapped the unutterable mystery, whereby the baptized Infant is made a "partaker in the Incarnation." On the contrary, this passage, as well as others, gives a decided testimony to the truth that Baptism is a Scriptural *Symbol* of that cleansing from sin, which is the work of the Spirit through the Truth.

6.—Rom. 6 : 3. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His Death?"

Upon this passage, the inquiry may be raised : "Is not Baptism said to bring us "*into* Jesus Christ?" And is not this that reverend mystery, that "participating in the Incarnation," that transforming of "the sinful flesh into the Body of Christ," which has been ascribed to this ordinance ? Is it not said, too, that we are "baptized into His death?" And does not this show that, in Baptism, our sinful nature is put to death through the power

of Christ, into whom we are thus actually engrafted?"

To this questioning I reply ; if such does appear to be the teaching of the passage, appearances here as well as elsewhere may prove deceitful. Taking language as it stands by itself is not always the way to penetrate its meaning. To reach this, in the present case, we must look at its connection with the Apostle's argument. He had, then, been setting forth the great doctrine of *Justification by faith* ; and, having done so, he comes in this part of his Epistle to a vindication of the doctrine from objection ; especially from the objection that it has an Antinomian tendency, or a tendency to bring the moral law into disrepute as a rule of life, on the ground that, being freely justified by *faith*, we need not consequently be strict in *obedience*. "What shall we say, then," he inquires, anticipating the language of an objector : "Shall we continue in *sin*, that grace may abound ? God forbid ! How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein ? *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death ?* Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death ; that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so *we* also should walk in newness of life. For as we have been planted together in the likeness of His death,

we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection ; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed ; that henceforth we should not serve sin : for he that is dead is freed from sin." Rom. 6 : 1-7.

Now, without attempting any labored criticism of this passage, the materials for which, however, are abundant, it will be enough to say, that the scope of the Apostle's argument fully justifies the following paraphrase :—v. 1. " Because, where sin abounds, there grace much more abounds, shall we go on in sin that God may have the glory of this superabounding grace? v. 2. Let no such injurious inference be drawn from the doctrine of Justification by faith, or the free gift of pardon and acceptance through faith in Christ. How shall we, who, by that inward renewing, which a justifying faith implies, have *died* unto sin, continue to live in the commission of sin? v. 3. *Know ye not, that so many of us as have been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, have, in that baptism, sealed a covenant, which binds us continually to die UNTO sin, even as Christ once died FOR sin?* v. 4. This is the solemn import of our Baptism. We are there, in a most significant Symbol, and in a most stringent covenanting, buried with Christ into death : the deep significancy and obligation of our Baptism being *this* : that, as Christ was raised up from the

dead by His glorious Father, even so we, through the power of the Spirit, should habitually walk by faith in the newness of a holy life. v. 5. This is the true import of the baptismal act; and if we be true Christians, we *shall* live conformably with this import. If we have been planted with Christ in a LIKENESS of His Death, we *shall* be also in the LIKENESS of His resurrection. As He died and rose again, so shall we, who are baptized, die from sin and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living? v. 6. In our inward renewal unto repentance and faith, professed and sealed in Baptism, our old man is crucified with Christ, for the very purpose that, henceforth, we should not serve sin. v. 7. For he who has thus died to sin, is by justification Christ's free man, and no longer a slave to sin."

Thus, by opening the Apostle's argument, and drawing the sense of the third verse from the tenor of the whole, we see that his words involve no such meaning as the Theory of Baptismal regeneration implies. This argument is briefly this: "The abounding of grace in the Justification of the penitent and *believing* sinner neither encourages nor tolerates sin; because, in accepting, by *faith*, that covenant of grace, which is sealed in Baptism, we come under the most solemn obligations to abstain

from all sin ; and, if we are not *hypocrites*, we have, at the same time, that inward principle of the new life, which the Spirit quickens in us by the Word of Truth, and which ultimately works the death of all sin in our natures." So far, therefore, as the language in the third verse is concerned, there is no need of seeking for any thing *else* than the Idea intimated in the paraphrase, that, " as many as are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ are baptized, either as adults with a *profession*, or as Infants in *symbol*, of that inward renewing unto Repentance and *faith in Christ*, which makes us dead *unto* sin, even as Christ once died *for* sin." To a similar purpose the argument is continued in the subsequent verses ; but it is needless to follow the reasoning further. The passage, so far as it has been examined, is one among others, which shew the significant and *symbolizing* nature of Christian Baptism. Its teaching lies, as the Apostle expresses it, τῷ ὁμοιώματι, in its "*likeness*" to that which it represents.

7. Col. 2 : 10-13. " Ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power ; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ ; buried with Him in Baptism ; wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead. And

you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him ; having forgiven you all trespasses."

This passage involves the same general sense with that just examined. In the light of what was there said, the sense of these words from the Epistle to the Colossians is beautifully apparent. No labored comment is needed to ascertain their meaning. A simple paraphrase will be sufficient.

v. 10. "All true Christians make up together the complete Body, of which Christ is the Head. v. 11. In Him they have the true circumcision, not that, which is made with hands, but that which is wrought by the Spirit, the circumcision of the heart, wrought by the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ ; i. e. that inner circumcision, which Christ requires. v. 12. All this is strikingly represented in their *Baptism*, wherein they are *symbolically* (literally, they cannot be) buried and raised with Christ. And their death unto sin, and their rising to newness of life, which are thus *symbolized*, are *effected* through their *belief* of that mighty working of God, which raised up Christ from the dead. v. 13. And thus it is that, having been once dead in sin, in the uncircumcised carnality of their nature, God hath quickened them together with Christ, having freely forgiven them all their trespasses."

In all this there is nothing, not even a shadow, of that Theory, which makes Infant Baptism a joint source with the Spirit of that "death unto sin and that new birth unto righteousness," which are mentioned. According to the Apostle, these effects call into action that "*faith*," which is ever the act of the conscious, intelligent mind of riper years. Moreover, besides implying the *symbolical* nature of Baptism, the passage distinctly intimates that, under the Gospel, Baptism, as a *seal* of the covenant of grace, holds the place of circumcision under the Law ;—or, that Baptism is to the Christian's babe what circumcision was to the Jewish Infant ;—both symbolizing the true, inner circumcision of the heart, the real Baptism of the Holy Ghost through *faith* in Christ unto newness of life. In the first eight verses of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, this same Divine process of "quickening us together with Christ," and of "raising us up together with him," to the new and heavenly life, is described without any allusion to Baptism, even as a symbol of the work ; though not without a very distinct reference again to *faith*, as the Christian's act under the quickening influence. "By grace are ye saved, through *faith*." These verses in Ephesians strongly confirm the view taken of Rom. 6 : 3, and of Col. 2 : 10-13. viz : that the reason, why Baptism is sometimes men-

tioned in connection with this spiritual death and resurrection, is to show that this Divine operation, though not wrought in and by Baptism, is yet, in and by Baptism taught and *symbolized*.

8. Tit. 3 : 5. "Not by works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to His mercy, He saved us, by the washing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

This is a very important passage. A little examination, however, will show how unwarrantably it has been pressed into the service of the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration. It is admitted, at the outset, that the phrase, "washing of Regeneration," means Baptism. But, at the same time, it is contended that the connected phrase, "Renewing of the Holy Ghost," means just what it expresses and no more, "Renovation by the Holy Spirit," including of course all the *fruits* of that renovation. It does not mean what is claimed for Baptism, that awful gift, which it is said, "is not to be confounded with *Renovation*, or a change of heart," nor restrained to any of the *fruits* of that change, but is "illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery, from which it flows, the Incarnation of our Redeemer."* It is simply and solely what the Apostle says it is, *Renovation*

* Tract 67, p. 43.

by the Spirit, with all the *fruits* which it bears. More especially is it maintained that this place, in Tit. 3 : 5, does not, as the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration claim, tie the "The Renewing of the Holy Ghost," as a special effect, to the "Washing of Regeneration," as, jointly with the Spirit, its *source* and *cause* ;* making the two simultaneous in that "fountain," wherein we are said to be born *of* Water and the Holy Ghost, even as our blessed and Incarnate Lord was born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb.† It is true that the author, from whom these expressions are quoted, was treating of John, 3 : 5 ; but it is also true that he considers that passage, and this in Tit. 3 : 5, as identical in sense ; and therefore, what he affirms, as the sense of the former, he holds as the sense of the latter. But the words of the Apostle to Titus neither make the change, of which he speaks, overpass Renovation and its fruits, nor teach that the "Renovation" and "the Washing" are *simultaneous* acts. To assume both or either of these is to force a meaning where the Bible expresses none, or to make Scripture for ourselves, when we cannot find it to our wish.

"The washing of Regeneration, which *symbolizes*, and the Renewing of the Holy Ghost, which *effects*, the great, saving work of our change from sin to

* Tract 67, p. 25, 26.

† *Idem*, p. 43.

holiness;" this is a paraphrase which exhausts the meaning of the passage ; leaving the question as to the *time* when this inner change takes place wholly untouched. As to the *means* of the change, we have abundant reason for believing that it is "the Word of Truth," as "the Sword of the Spirit." This Spirit, we know, accompanied the Word preached. "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." 1 Cor. 2 : 4. And this was to shew that the *faith* of the early Christians stood, "not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." v. 5. So Peter, when *writing* to the Christians, to whom Paul had *preached*, says : "They"—Paul and his companions in labor,—“have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven :” *literally*, “have evangelized you with the Holy Ghost.” *ἐναγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.* 1 Pet. 1 : 12. This “Demonstration of the Spirit and of power,” as accompanying the preaching of the Word, was, no doubt, sometimes miraculous ; yet, unless we suppose that *all*, to whom Paul preached and Peter wrote, were endowed with miraculous gifts, we must allow that, generally, the Demonstration was made in the ordinary work of their renewal and sanctification. It is more than probable, then, that, in those early days, when the

Word preached was so generally accompanied with effectual power, and when they, who preached it, were guided with more than ordinary wisdom in judging the hearts and characters of men, the "Washing of Water" and the "Renewing of the Spirit" were generally, in point of *time*, very near each other. To name but a single instance : After Philip had preached Christ to the Eunuch, with evidence of the Holy Ghost accompanying the Word ; he at once baptized him. Acts, 8 : 26-38. The evidence of the Work of the Spirit was satisfying. The Evangelist needed not to wait, as, in these days of feebler power and dimmer wisdom in the ministers of Christ, it is sometimes thought expedient to wait, for professions to prove their sincerity, for character to test its permanency, or for feelings either to settle into principles or to vanish in forgetfulness, before deciding the question whether he should, or should not, be at once baptized. There was enough in all the circumstances of the case to settle that question at once ; at once, therefore, was the sealing ordinance administered. Besides, here, as in other cases, the work of the Spirit went *before* Baptism, however near, in point of *time*, the two lay together. And I think there can be little doubt that it was some such state of things as that presented in the case of Philip and the Eunuch, which led to the occasional, though not

to the constant, mention of the Work of the Spirit in the new birth and its symbolizing, sealing rite in Baptism, in that close connection of language, with which we sometimes meet. This close connection in language, however, proves not that the water of Baptism is, jointly with the Spirit, "the source and cause" of the new birth, or that the Baptism and the Birth are, in point of *time*, simultaneous. On the contrary, examination will, I apprehend, uniformly show, as in the case of the Eunuch, not only that, in point of time, they were actually separated, but also that, in point of *order*, the inward Birth of the Spirit *preceded* the application of its outward seal, or symbol. We have seen this in all the cases thus far examined. Let us see if it were not so in the case alluded to in Titus, 3 : 5.

What says the context? Read for answer this part of Paul's letter to his "Son Titus after the common faith." "Put them"—the Cretians—"in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." Then supposing Titus to inquire—"What encouragement have I to preach such things to these Cretians, whom one of their own prophets" has represented as

"Always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies,"

the Apostle replies : " You have even this encouragement : We ourselves,"—I Paul, who speak, thou Titus, whom I address, and others like us, were once as unpromising subjects as these very Cretians ; myself especially having been the " chief of sinners." I say, " We ourselves were once foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one another. But," see, oh ! see, what the Gospel, which you are to preach to your Cretians, has, by the power of the Holy Ghost, effected even in us ; " for, after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which *we* have done, but according to His *mercy*, He saved us,"—*us, Paul and Titus*—" by the Washing of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour ; that, being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Thus encouraged by what has been wrought in ourselves, be not slow, or heartless in calling even your debased Cretians to the new life of holiness, which I have enjoined. What I have said is a " faithful saying ;" in full accord with the genius of the Gospel ; " and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they, which have *believed* in God might be careful to maintain good works." Tit. 3 : 1-8.

Here we see that the particular "renewing," of which the Apostle speaks, was nothing more nor less than *his own conversion*, and that of Titus ; a change. which, in Paul at least, *preceded* his Baptism, and was simply his being "turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," by the mighty working of the Holy Ghost, accompanying the pungent preaching of Jesus himself and His servant Ananias, and operating through days of an intense struggle in prayer, which began in that heart-surrendering petition,— "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" His conversion was no mystery wrought on unconscious Infancy, but an intelligible renewal, wrought by most reasonable and adequate causes, in years of most intelligent and ripened rebellion against God. It is extravagant and unreasonable to say, as the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration contend, that the conversion of St. Paul and his endowment with the gift of the Holy Ghost, both for ordinary and extraordinary grace, did not take place until the moment and in the act of his Baptism. In the account of the whole transaction, as recorded in the ninth and twenty-second chapters of the book of Acts, his Baptism was preceded by every circumstance, which could characterize a true conversion and the bestowment of all the gifts of the Spirit. There were his arrest, on his way to Damascus, by

the out-shining of the Sun of Righteousness ; the short, but searching Sermon of Jesus, carried by the subduing power of the Spirit to the soul of the stricken man ; that cry of a most submissive heart, uttered in the true spirit of *faith* and of a most *repentant* consciousness of his awful sins, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" his overpowering and literally blinding sense of the manifested glory of Christ ; his three days' struggle in prayer and fasting at Damascus ; the Christian instruction from Ananias, accompanied by the laying on of his hands, and directing him to Baptism as the first outward Rite of Christ's religion ; and the falling of the curtain of darkness from his eyes as the miraculous gift came upon him and he was "filled with the Holy Ghost." All these circumstances transpired, not *when* he was baptized, not *after* he was baptized, but *before* he was baptized. *After* all these things had happened unto him, he proceeded to obey the direction of Ananias. "Having called on the name" of Jesus, and "having arisen" from his suppliant act, he "was baptized and washed away his sins" in that significant Rite, which was to him at once the symbol of that full renewal, and the seal of that free forgiveness, which he had already received. In the face of all this, who can say that Paul was not converted and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost until

the time and in the mystery of Baptism? If an army of Post-Nicene writers were to concur in the assertion, that could not alter the testimony of incontestable facts.*

To return, then, to Titus, 3 : 5 ; it is an utterly groundless assumption to take the naked words, "He saved us by the Washing of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghost ;"—words spoken of the particular conversion of the adult Paul and Titus,—and to use them as a proof that, in *Infant Baptism*, the two things are tied together in the relation of source and issue, cause and effect ; and not only so, but as a proof that this Baptism is as awful a miracle as that, which was wrought, when the Holy Ghost made the Son of God incarnate in human flesh ! And yet, next to John, 3 : 5, this is the principal text cited to prove these and all associated, though modified views of Baptismal Regeneration, as applied to the case of Infants.

I have now examined, with one exception, all the texts on the subject of Baptism, which it is at all important to examine ; and, thus far, have not found one that yields any support to the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, as that Theory, in its various modifications, has been set before us. On

* For the views above referred to, see Tract 67, p. 174-176 ; N. Y. Ed.

the contrary, every text examined has shed light, more or less clearly, on the position that Baptism was designed, not for the miraculous gift of the Spirit in the communication to us of the Incarnate nature of Christ, but as a *Symbol* of the Spirit's work in our regeneration "by the Word of Truth," and as a *Seal* of the promise of forgiveness to Faith in Christ. The only text, which remains to be examined, is that, which has been called "*The Key text*" to this whole subject. I have reserved this for the last place because I readily grant that it is the most important text on the subject ; and because, in obedience to the true Canon of Interpretation in the case, I think it ought not, as a text of disputed meaning, to be interpreted until we have looked abroad through the Bible, — especially through the Christian Scriptures,—for the best and fullest light, which can be collected on the point proposed for illustration. And yet, though standing as we now do, at the focus of all this light, I shall endeavor, as far as possible, to place this important text in its *own* light : to examine it by its own shining ; and to see whether, fairly viewed, it does not give forth to other passages the same light, which it receives from them.

9.—John, 3 : 5 ; "Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

In seeking for the meaning of these Words, I shall not avail myself of the Interpretation, by which some would *cut*. instead of *untying*, the knot of difficulty with the assertion that there is no mention made here of *literal* Baptism. With the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration I wage no controversy on this point. For the reasonableness of the thing, as well as for argument's sake, I admit that, by the Birth of *Water*, literal Baptism is intended.

1. Yet in explaining this text, I urge in the first place, that our Saviour does not say here, and can not be made to say, that the Birth of Water and the Birth of the Spirit are effected at one and the same instant. This is one of the points, which, under the false Canon of Interpretation already noticed, is ever silently and without reason assumed. Taking it for granted that the Water, spoken of, means the Water of Baptism, the supporters of that Canon take it also for granted, as something that necessarily follows, that the birth of the Spirit is simultaneous with it and affected by it. It needs but a moment's thought to show that this assumption is wholly groundless. On one occasion Christ says : "He that *believed* and is *baptized*² shall be saved ;" Mark, 16 : 16. On another, Peter, in answer to the inquiry, "What shall we do?" replies : *Repent* and be *baptized*, every one of you ;" Acts, 2 : 38.

Now faith and repentance are essential effects of the work of the Spirit ; we can do neither the one nor the other without His gift. What Christ and His Apostle say, therefore on these two occasions, amounts to this : “ Seek the gift of the Spirit unto faith and Repentance ; and, having obtained the great object of your search, profess and seal your faith and repentance by being baptized in the name of Christ.” From this, too, we may as reasonably assume that we must at one and the same moment *believe* and be baptized, *repent* and be baptized, and that faith and repentance are produced by Baptism, as, jointly with the Spirit, their source and cause ; as we may assume, from John, 3 : 5, that we must be born of *Water* and born of the *Spirit* at one and the same moment ; and that the latter is effected by the former as its joint source and cause. It is true that the *order*, in which the two things are named in John, 3 : 5, is different from that observed on the two occasions referred to. Faith and Repentance, as included *in* the gift of the Spirit, are on those occasions named *before* Baptism ; while in John, 3 : 5, the birth of the Spirit, as *including* faith and repentance, is named *after* Baptism. Yet the things named in each case are really *the same*. We may say, indeed that the gift of the Spirit includes *more* than faith and repentance, even the *power* to believe and repent. Still, this

would be but saying that this power itself, like the faith and repentance, which spring from it, is made by Christ and His Apostle an antecedent to Baptism. And this, as effectually as the former inference, overthrows the Theory that the power, here intended, is the miraculous gift of the Spirit in and of the Baptismal Waters. If we say that faith and repentance, as included *in* the gift of the Spirit, are and must be communicated in and of Baptism, then, so far as Infants are concerned, we contradict our Church, which says that these are things, which Infants, "by reason of their tender age can not perform." And if we say that the gift of the Spirit includes *more* than faith and repentance, even the *power* to believe and repent, and if we insist that this *power* is and must be communicated in and by Baptism ; then we contradict Christ and His Apostle, who put faith and repentance, flowing out of that power, as *antecedents* to Baptism. Either way the Theory is overthrown by showing the actual, if not the necessary separation, in point of *time*, between the Symbolical Birth of water and the real birth of the Spirit.

Whether the *power* to believe and repent can be given to the Infant in Baptism, either to be kept for exercise in riper years, or to be lost by post-baptismal sin, is but another form of the question so largely discussed when considering the sug-

gestions arising out of the first chapter. It needs, therefore, no further discussion in this place. It may, indeed, be said that, by nature, and in our worst estate through sin, we all have a *power* to believe and repent, so far as the faculties are concerned, which faith and repentance bring into exercise ; that what we need is, not the *power*, but the will to *exercise* that power ; and that, therefore, the office of the Spirit in Infant Baptism may consist in *giving* that "good will ;" and, in riper years, "working *with* us when we *have* that good will." But this merely shifts the difficulty to a new term ; showing, however, more clearly than ever, the moral impossibility that the work of the Spirit should be wrought on unconscious Infancy. For, if there be one thing that, more than any other, requires our *conscious activity*, it is a change of our *will* from evil to good. How this change is wrought by the Spirit, even through the Word of Truth in riper years, we may never be able to fathom. Two things, however, I think we may be said to know : 1. The office of the Spirit in this part of His work is—to *change* the will from evil to good. He does not impart a literally *new* will. The Christian has not *two* separate wills, the one evil, and the other good. Like other men, he has and can have but *one* power or faculty of willing. All that we can say is—that his *one* faculty may be so strongly so.

licit and drawn contrary ways by contrary inducements as, at times, almost to make him feel *as though* he had two separate wills. And yet he has not and cannot have ; and the office of the Spirit with him consists in simply *changing* his naturally evil will to a will graciously good ; and then continually “working with him” that this good will may, on the whole, be governor of his inner man, despite the numberless solicitations to evil, which he may feel. 2. It is possible that, under the constitution, which God has adopted for fallen man, a *change* of the will cannot be effected without the *concurrence* of the will. Such a change, so far as it is knowable, is a conscious act, and, as such, cannot be performed in unconscious Infancy. The will changes only as it feels *reasons* for change. I say not that the will in Infancy is incapable of *action*. Under the promptings of bodily appetite and pain, and even under the power of mental desire and passion, it certainly *does* act. But, upon moral and spiritual truths, as reasons and motives to action, it is incapable of acting, because reason is not yet so developed as to be able to comprehend them. How early reason may become able to comprehend, at least, the simple elements of moral and spiritual truth, so that, through them, the Spirit may effect a change of the natural will, it is not for me to say. I merely state that there is a period,

longer or shorter, in the Infancy of every human being, during which God is pleased to leave both the Reason and the will incapable of action upon the truths of the moral and spiritual world ; and therefore, the will itself incapable of being actively concurrent in a change from evil to good.

2. But, to return from this brief digression, I urge, in the second place, that, in John, 3 : 5, Christ does not say that, in Baptism, " God by His Spirit moves again upon the face of the waters, sanctifies them for our cleansing, and cleanses us thereby." This is another of the points quietly but groundlessly assumed under the false Canon of Interpretation, to which I have adverted. If we may assume such mysteries as implied, when not a word is said of them in the text, which we happen to be interpreting, then we may assume any thing we please ; and so again, if we cannot *find*, may at least *make* as much Scripture to our purpose as we need.

I do not forget, here, what our Church says in her Baptismal office ; that God, " by the Baptism of His well-beloved Son in the river Jordan, did *sanctify* water to the *mystical* washing away of sin." I have already commented on this language ; but I wish to add somewhat towards a fuller explication. What, then, can our Church mean by this language, but that, according to the established

use and sense of the word, "sanctify," when applied to external things, God, by the Baptism of His Son, did separate and set apart, not all waters, but the element of water, to the use designated, that of "the *mystical* washing away of sin?" This is undoubtedly her meaning: but mark what she says: God "set apart water to the *mystical* washing away of sin;" the *mystical*, not the *efficient*; the *typical*, not the *actual*; the *symbolized*, not the *operated*, washing away of sin. In other words, by the Baptism of Christ, God designated water to be perpetually a "mystical," or symbolical *seal* of the *pardon* of sin, and a "mystical," or symbolical *sign* of *purification* from sin. This is all that the sense of the words, "sanctify" and "mystical," as here used, either requires, or admits. We cannot, with any show of reason, force any further meaning on this language in our service for Baptism; and even if we could, we could never, without sheer extravagance, push that meaning to the extreme of justifying any commentator in assuming for Christ's words in John, 3 : 5, the sense put upon them; that "God, by His Spirit, moves again on the face of the waters, sanctifies them for our cleansing, and cleanses us thereby;" understanding this language as it is designed to be understood; viz: that, by the consecrating act, *holiness* becomes not only a property of the water, but also a *power* of the

Water ; or that, by such act, the Water receives not only a principle of sanctity, but also a *power* to sanctify. If we may assume this, when the Divine Speaker says no such thing, then, I repeat, we may assume any thing, not impossible or absurd ; and so, if we can not draw our Creed *from* the Bible, we may at least force our Creed *upon* the Bible.

3. Again ; passing from the birth of *Water* to that of the *Spirit*, and leaving the point of *time*, for the present, out of the question, I urge, in the third place, that when Christ says we must be born of "the Spirit," He does not say that this "gift of God" is "as illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery, from which it flows, the incarnation of our Redeemer ;" nor does He say that the Holy Spirit gives a new life in *the fountain* opened by Him, we being born therein of Him, even as our Blessed and Incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born of Him in the Virgin's womb." Here is another point, most gratuitously assumed under the false Canon of Interpretation, which I have indicated. What matters it, how many ancient writers say that the Birth of the Spirit consists in such a mystery ? Does their assertion prove that these simple words of Christ carry a sense so strange ? Suppose that one of them *does* say that, in the Baptism by water, " the

sinful flesh is changed into the Body of Christ ;” * does this prove that Christ put that subtle *seed* of Transubstantiation into *Baptism*, that His Doctors might ripen the *fruit* of that pestilent error in *the Lord's Supper*? Where, I pray, must this strange system of interpreting Christ have its end? Where can it find its end, save in that monster-system of false Divinity, which practically overlays, and, in effect, crushes out, the life of that beautiful and shapely body of Truth, which He once informed with His Spirit and made quickening to our souls?

When Nicodemus, misapprehending Christ's meaning about being “born again,” and supposing, from the force of the word *ἀνωθεν*, that it implied the necessity of being literally born “a second time,”—inquired; “How can these things be?”—Christ reprovéd him; not, however, because Nicodemus doubted the possibility of an operation so absurd, but because, being “a master in Israel,” a teacher of God's people, he did not know better than to suppose that the acknowledged Divine Teacher before him intended a meaning so monstrous. Had the thought, which Nicodemus conceived, been truly Christ's, his question would have been a sensible one, and Christ would have answered it, not in a reproving, but in an explana-

* Leo, quoted in Tract 67; p. 46.

tory way. And yet, the operation, ascribed by this false Canon of Interpretation to Baptism by water is as incredible as that, to which Nicodemus supposed our Saviour to refer ; and if the mystery of the new Birth of the Spirit is supposed to consist in what is here ascribed to it, we may reasonably ask the " Nicodemus question," How can these things be? and our question will deserve, not a reproof, but an explanation, such as hath never yet been given either by the Great Master Himself, or by any of His subordinate teachers. But, if that new Birth consist in no such thing, then the question, by taking such a meaning for granted, would be impertinent, and they who assumed such a meaning, might well be reprov'd, as masters of God's Christian Israel, for supposing that our Divine Teacher's weighty words meant a process so impossible.

4. Throwing away, then, all these groundlessly assumed meanings of Christ's words, let us, with humble minds, endeavor to ascertain, so far as we may, what is their true sense.

"The Kingdom of God," mentioned in John, 3 : 5, has *two* conditions : the one in *Time*, the other in *Eternity* ; the one on *earth*, the other in *heaven* ; the one *preparatory*, the other *final* ; the one for *probation*, the other for *rewards*. To these two conditions of "the kingdom," Baptism and re-

novation, the *Symbolical* Regeneration and the *Spiritual*, bear analogous relations. Without Baptism, we cannot enter "the Kingdom" on earth ;—without renovation, adults cannot enter "the Kingdom" in Heaven. This, I apprehend, will be admitted as a statement fully sustained by the general teachings of the Bible.

And, with this general statement, the particular words of Christ, in John, 3 : 5, perfectly agree. Understanding "the Kingdom of God" to be there spoken of in its *comprehension*, or as including both its earthly or temporal, and its heavenly or eternal state, it is abundantly evident that Christ means to say that the "birth of Water," or Baptism, is necessary as our act, or privilege, of entering "the Kingdom" here ; while the Birth of "the Spirit," or inward renovation, is necessary as our meetness, or preparation, for possessing or enjoying "the Kingdom" both here and hereafter. With this, too, the language of our Church accords, when it represents the Water in Baptism as "an outward and visible sign ;"—while it recognizes "the death unto sin and the new-birth unto righteousness" as "the inward and Spiritual grace,"—the "things signified."

And now, if it be asked ; What, then, does our Church mean, when she says of a Sacrament in general, that it is not only "an outward and visible

sign of an inward and spiritual grace," but also "*a means*, whereby we receive the same;" or when she says of Baptism in particular, that "*we are hereby made* the children of Grace?"—I apprehend that a satisfactory reply will not be attended with any difficulty.

Why are we required to be "born of Water;" or to be Baptized? Because it is Christ's ordained mode of receiving members into His Church, or Kingdom, on earth. And why is it necessary that we should be "born of the Spirit;" or renewed unto holiness? Because, in every one capable of actual sin, it is that, "without which no man can see the Lord," or be happy with Him either on earth, or in heaven. These points are clear. But, why are we required to enter the Church *here*, in order to our entering heaven *hereafter*? This is the point, on which we now seek light. I answer then, we must enter the Church *here*, in order to enter heaven *hereafter*, because, whatever God, in His unfathomable goodness and abundant power, may be pleased to do in saving those, who are incapable of being regenerated by His Spirit through "the Word of Truth," or those, who live in places where His Church is not known, or not organized, His Church was and is intended to be, or rather, to embody, that great, Divine System of means and instruments, in the use of which He ordinarily

holds present intercourse with men's minds, reaches their hearts, renews, sanctifies and edifies them "unto the perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." His *ordinary* way now is, not to make us in Infancy partakers of an unutterable mystery, that we may thereby become members of His Church—the Scriptures teach quite another doctrine as to membership in the visible Church—but, to take us in Infancy, as members of his Church by Baptism, that we may, with our first opening susceptibilities and powers, find ourselves amid holy associations, and under holy influences, and thus realize the best means, opportunities and incitements for seeking and attaining to the knowledge, love and obedience of God and His Word ; for becoming "renewed in the Spirit of our minds ;" and thus for ripening unto His Heavenly Kingdom. His first act, under the Christian Economy, is, not to perform a miracle on our unconscious infancy, that He may thus make us members of His Church ; and then leave us morally sure to fall into the awful aggravations of post-baptismal sin ; but, to adopt us in Infancy into His *family* on earth, as His graciously, though undeservedly privileged *children*, that He may the better discipline us for our actual sins, bring us to "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," and thus make us finally holy

as He is holy," and "perfect as He is perfect." His way is, to enter us very early into His *school*, though ignorant, and defiled in our ignorance, that He may the more successfully teach us His ways, and make us "wise unto Salvation" through that "meekly received" and inwardly "engrafted Word," by which His Spirit instructs us unto Christ, and which, thus used and received, "is able to save our souls." Such, manifestly is the great office, or place, of His Church on earth, in all her divinely appointed means and influences. Inasmuch, then, as it is by *Baptism* that we enter the visible Church, and, without Baptism, can not enter, we may say, with no little propriety and force, that not only is Baptism "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and Spiritual grace," but also "a *means* whereby we *receive* the same," being "thereby made *children* of grace," brought into the family and school of a most *gracious* God and Father, and surrounded with all His most *gracious* provisions and influences for securing what is at first unsecured, our Souls' renewal and sanctification to fit us for an eternal blessedness. This view fully satisfies the language of our Church in her Catechism. It shows what she means when she says that Water in Baptism is "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and Spiritual grace;" and what she means, when she says that Baptism

itself is "a means,"—not *the* means, as though there were no other, but—"a means," one of a great *system* of means, "whereby we receive" the grace so signified. This, too, as I humbly trust it has been made evident, is the general teaching of the Word of God, and in accordance with the particular teaching of Christ in John, 3 : 5.

And now, having collected the general sense of Scripture on the subject of Baptism, and elicited what is evidently the particular sense of John, 3 : 5, I venture to give the following paraphrase of these important words, as expressive of their true and full import. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of *Water*, which in Baptism mystically *Symbolizes*, and of the *Spirit*, which in reality efficiently *works*, the needed renewal and sanctification of his nature, he cannot ordinarily be saved. Without the birth of *Water* he cannot enter the Church, as the earthly state of my Kingdom, my constituted family and school for his Spiritual training and discipleship ; and, without the birth of the *Spirit*, he cannot enter heaven, as that future and final perfection of my Kingdom, for which that Spiritual training and discipleship are designed to fit him."

Touching now the point of *time*, as involved in this passage, the conclusion is undeniable that, in what He says, Christ does not tie the time of this

“ birth of the Spirit ” to the time of this “ birth of Water.” If He does not tie them together as Spiritual *cause* and *effect*, He cannot tie them together as *simultaneous acts*. He places the one, as a Divine *Symbol*, before the other. He indicates the *Sacramental* as an introduction to the way, which ordinarily leads to the *Spiritual*. He ordains Baptism at the gate of entrance into His visible Kingdom on earth ; and He reveals the Spirit's work of renewing and sanctifying grace, as that, without which no actual sinner can possibly enter His perfected Kingdom in heaven. But He leaves the *time*, when the Symbol shall be followed by the thing Symbolized, to be decided by that, which alone can decide the question of every man's Salvation, the movements of God's Spirit and Truth, of His grace and Providence, on the minds of those multitudes, to whom His Church and Gospel may come. I say, ‘ the question of every man's salvation,’ meaning, of course, the salvation of all, who are responsible agents, and to whom the teachings of Revelation are made known.

In accordance with the foregoing view, and in confirmation of it, we cannot fail to notice that, as a Symbol of the Spirit's regenerating and sanctifying work through the instrumentality of God's quickening and purifying Truth, *Water* is the most appropriate and beautiful element, that could have

been selected. How Water gives new life and strength to the fainting, dying pilgrim of the Desert! How it cleanses the dust and filth from the body, or the feet of him, who has become unclean from neglect or from travel! And, in both these effects, how appropriately and beautifully does it teach in the Symbol of Baptism, the life-giving and the purifying power of *the Spirit* upon the Soul, that is dead in Sin, and that has become defiled with both its guilt and its corruption!

At the same time, we cannot fail to notice the fact, that, in John, 3:5, Christ says nothing of the proper *subjects* of Baptism. He leaves the seal of the Covenant under the *Gospel*, as it came in from under the *Law*, to be applied generally to the Infant seed of God's people; and yet, when occasion requires it, to be applied to those adults also, who have not received it in Infancy;—and, leaving these things thus, He goes at once to His great Teaching about the Divine Symbol and its Diviner Substance, as needed in opening the *entrance*, and in training us on the *way*, which lead toward God and Heaven. In His teaching, He addresses an *adult*; and evidently designs to present its main, fundamental truth to the consideration of those, who are capable of understanding it. In its main import, it is but another instance of what the Bible says to those, who are under the Bible, and who

may be savingly affected, if by nothing more, by its simple yet sublime elements of Truth.

There are, of course, other passages in the New Testament, which refer to Baptism ; but their references to it are incidental or indirect ; and there is nothing in them, from which we can collect light for determining the true nature of this Christian Ordinance. They all fall in and harmonize with that view of Baptism, which, by a just application of the principles of Interpretation, may most conclusively be shown to embody the true sense of those leading passages, which have now been examined. It will not be necessary, therefore, to continue further an examination, which has already gone beyond the length at first intended.

CHAPTER V.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

AFTER the foregoing prolonged examination of leading passages on the subject of Baptism, it is desirable to give at least a summary of what may be considered as the nature of Baptism, looking at it in its broad, general relation to the Christian scheme. The discussion, thus far, has been devoted chiefly to a refutation of erroneous views of the subject. Nevertheless, no one can have followed the discussion without seeing that, in setting aside those erroneous views, others, like rays from an uncovered light, have, all along, been gradually beaming forth out of those Scriptures of Truth, from which the obscurings of a false sense have been successively withdrawn. In the heart of its nature we have already seen what Baptism is ; but there are some things, which pertain to it rather as circumstantial, than as essential to the Rite ; or that lie on the surface rather than at the core. Upon these, as well as upon the essentials

of the ordinance, it is desirable to pause somewhat more attentively than it has yet been possible to do. I begin, however, with the things essential.

1. In the first place, then, as an Institution of Christ, and as significant of His true intent, Baptism is a DIVINE SYMBOL of Regeneration.

This is not a contested point, any more than its analogue in the Lord's Supper, that the consecrated Bread and Wine are Divine Symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ. In both cases it is admitted that the outward parts are Symbols of the inward ; that the material is significant of the Spiritual. So far, therefore, as Baptism is concerned, the controversy turns, not on this, but on another point ; whether the Symbol is also, jointly with the Spirit, the source and cause of Regeneration, in the sense of an actual impartation, even to Infants, of a new and spiritual life ; of a communication to the recipient of the very Divine substance, or nature. Of this point, however, I have already disposed ; nor will it be necessary to dwell much longer on the other,—the *symbolical* nature of Baptism. This is implied in all the texts, which have been examined, particularly in those, which speak of our being “born of Water and the Spirit,” and of our being “saved by the washing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Whatever else may be disputed of these passages, this at least will be

admitted by all, that the "Birth of Water" is a Symbol of the birth of the Spirit ;" or that "the Washing of Regeneration" is a Symbol of the "Renewing of the Holy Ghost."

On these and similar texts our Church takes her stand, when she says that "*Baptism* doth *represent* unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him : that, as He died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin and rise again unto righteousness." It can *represent* this only in its character as a *Symbol* of that important change. The Catechism, too, expressly says, and it must be on the same authority, that Baptism is "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and Spiritual grace."

In its character as a Symbol of Regeneration, Baptism seems originally to have symbolized two great facts, with the truths, which those facts involve : 1. The fact of our *Spiritual* Resurrection in *this* life ; the "Renewing of the Holy Ghost ;" involving the truths that, by nature, we are "dead in trespasses and sins," and therefore *need* to be "born again to a new and spiritual life." As a Symbol of *this* change, Baptism is called "the *Washing* of Regeneration." 2. The fact of our *literal* Resurrection from the dead at the *last Day*, the new opening of glory beyond the grave ;

involving the truths that Christ died and rose again, and that, as the certain fruit of His Death and resurrection, all true Christians shall literally follow Him in both, and in the glory, which is to ensue. As a Symbol of *this* change, Baptism represents the death of the *Body*, and its rising again in the likeness of Christ's "*glorious Body*," or as Christ Himself calls it, "*The Regeneration* when the Son of *Man* shall sit on the throne of His glory." Matt. 19 : 28. We have already seen reason to believe that the early Christians, at their baptism, professed and sealed their faith in the fact of Christ's Resurrection from the dead, and in the doctrine of the future resurrection of their own bodies. Of *this* resurrection, therefore, as well as of that, which is Spiritual in the present life, Baptism may be considered as a Divine Symbol, a *teaching* representation : and in this sense, it is full of important meaning and power. The truths, which it "*holds forth*," do, when received into a living *faith*, into minds renewed by the Spirit, operate mightily to the strengthening of hope, courage and constancy, in meeting, sustaining and overcoming all those conflicts, trials and persecutions, to which, for Christ's sake, we may, in this life, be exposed.

2. In the second place ; as an Institution of Christ, and as representing Him in *action* among

His people, Baptism is a COVENANTING and SEALING Rite.

And this, like the former, is a sense of Baptism, which lies in the very heart of the ordinance. Infants, it is true, are not capable of entering intelligently and voluntarily into *covenant* with God, or of receiving, understandingly and cordially, the *seal* of forgiven sin : but they *are* capable of being *taken* into Covenant with God and of being admitted into a state, which is endowed with a *sealed* promise of forgiveness on the annexed terms of the Gospel. Of this we have proof in the case of children, under the old dispensation. They were all "circumcised the eighth day," and, by that act, were *taken* within the relation constituted by God's covenant with His ancient people. It was an act of God, covenanting with *them*, and taking them within the relation of His Covenant. Among His people as a *whole*, children were included by *name* ; and thus the conditional privileges of the Covenant were thrown around the entire nation. "Ye stand this day, *all* of you, before the Lord your God," . . . "all the men of Israel, your *little ones*, your wives," &c. . . . "that thou shouldst enter into *covenant* with the Lord thy God and into His *oath*, which the Lord thy God *maketh with thee* this day." Deut. 29 : 10-12. It was a Covenant and oath, which *God made* with *them* and their *little*

ones. He asked not whether those little ones could comprehend, or whether any of them would fulfil, that covenant ; but He *took them* into it : He *made with them* the covenant and the oath : He sovereignly, yet graciously bound Himself to them, and them to Himself, on assigned conditions ; and the benefits of the act followed or failed, according as those conditions were, or were *not*, fulfilled.

The *conditions* of the Covenant under the Old Dispensation were expressed in these words : “Thou shalt *return* unto the Lord thy God, and shalt *obey* His voice, thou and thy *children*, with all thine *heart*, and with all thy *soul*.” Deut. 30 : 2. These conditions involved *Repentance* and *faith* ; since, without these, they could not *return* to God and *obey* Him with all the *heart* and *soul*.

Again ; the *blessings*, promised on these conditions, were partly *temporal* and partly *Spiritual*. “Then,”—that is, on the prescribed conditions,—“the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land, which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it ; and He will multiply thee above thy fathers.” Thus far the *temporal*. “And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy *heart* and the heart of thy *seed*, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest *live*.” Deut. 30 : 3–6. And thus far the *Spiritual*. On the conditions prescribed, He pledged Himself with an

oath to give them rich temporal favors, and far richer spiritual blessings; the *true* circumcision, that of the *heart*, love for *God*, and *life* forevermore. And these blessings He pledged not only to them as a *whole*, but also to their *seed*, or *children*; of course, on their becoming capable of *loving* Him as well as of being placed under His covenant. On condition of *return* to Him, He promised to work in them *love* for Himself; and on condition of *obedience*, flowing out of that love, He promised to give them *life* with Himself.

It may be thought worthy of remark, that even the *temporal* favors, which, on these conditions, God promised them, seem designed to lead their thoughts towards the *Spiritual*, that were to follow. Why did He promise to bring them—not into some heathen land, of which they had never heard, and for which they had never longed, but—“into the land, which their *fathers* possessed,” at least as temporary sojourners once, and towards which they had long been taught to bend their own earnest desires? Why, but to intimate that the Spiritual blessings, *love* for God and *life* with God, were man’s primitive state, lost by the fall, and to be restored by grace? And why did He promise, in that land to “*multiply* them *above* their fathers?” Why, but to intimate that Heaven, once regained, with *love* for God and *life* with God, would consti-

tute an eternal portion, never to be forfeited, and richer far than the primitive perfection and happiness, from which the great forefather fell?

Again; of the Covenant, under which these blessings, both temporal and Spiritual, were thus conditionally promised, the Rite of *circumcision* was the Ancient *seal*. Hence, St. Paul says of Abraham, "The father of the faithful," "He received the sign of Circumcision, *a seal* of the Righteousness of the faith, which he had, yet being uncircumcised;" Rom. 4 : 11. Mark the order, here indicated. It is said—not that Abraham's *faith* was prior to God's *Covenant* with him; but that it was prior to his receiving *the seal* of that covenant; the "Seal of the Righteousness of *faith*;" the seal of his actual justification with God. This, too, is the order fixed by the history of the transactions themselves. First, God made a Covenant with Abraham, before Abraham had expressed any faith in God; Gen. 12 : 1–3. Then, Abraham obeyed God, by "departing" from Haran, "as the Lord had spoken unto him;" thus, for the first time *acting* faith in God; Gen. 12 : 4. Next, twenty-four years later, God *confirmed* His Covenant unto Abraham and his *seed*; and annexed to it *the seal* of Circumcision, as "a token of the Covenant betwixt them;" Gen. 17 : 11. Then it was, and not until then, that Abraham and his family re-

ceived the *seal* of that Covenant, under which he had been living, and of that Justification, which he had been enjoying for four-and-twenty years ; Gen. 17, *passim*, particularly, vs. 1, 7, 11, 23, 24.

And now, from this brief sketch of the Covenant under the Old Dispensation, let us turn to its correspondences under the New.

Under the Gospel, then, the *Covenant* itself remains *unchanged*. This is proved by what the Apostle writes ; Gal. 3 : 17 : " This I say ; that the Covenant, which was confirmed before of God in CHRIST, the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Why was this Covenant said to have been confirmed in *Christ*, so long before Christ came in the flesh ? It was to intimate that God's Covenant of grace is ONE ; and that it really had Christ for its surety before, as well as after, " the fullness of the time," or period of His Advent.

Under the Gospel, too the *conditions* of the Covenant remain *unchanged*. It is true that now these conditions are more fully expressed, as " Repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ ;" Acts, 20 : 21 : but they are not *different* conditions. What is expressed now was implied then, in " *returning* to God, and *obeying* His voice ;" returning to Him by *repentance*, and obey-

ing him in *faith* ; as a God, who, even then, held intercourse with them through a surety, and whose *Name*, however faintly traced, has now but more clearly shone out, "the Sun of Righteousness," "the Lamb of God ;" "the Christ," with all anointings.

Under the Gospel moreover, the *Blessings*, promised on these conditions, are *unchanged*. It is true, that less is said now of the *temporal* and more of the *Spiritual*. The Gospel talks out and at large of the forgiveness of sin, of justification by faith, of peace with God, of the grace of the Spirit, of the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, of the richness of the glory of His inheritance in the Saints, and of eternal life as a kingdom, and a crown, and an Inheritance, which shall never fade away. Still, amid all this profuse display of the Divine treasures, revealed and in store for us, the Gospel does not utterly forget to say that the "godliness," which is required of us, "hath promise of the life that *now* is," as well as "of that, which is *to come* ;" 1 Tim. 4 : 8.

Under the Gospel, still further, the *Seal* of the Covenant is *unchanged*. That is, its significancy and effect are the same as ever. The *form* of the Seal is new. The unbloody washing of Baptism has come into the place of the bloody washing of circumcision. Still, it has the same old meaning ;

the circumcision of the *heart*, the renewing of the *mind*; and it binds to the same thing, fidelity to God, life-long constancy in His service. This change in the mere *form* of the Seal is indicated with sufficient clearness in the passage already examined, Col. 2:11, 12. For, although the phrases, "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands," and "the circumcision of Christ," refer to the inward work of the Spirit, yet the figurative language, which immediately follows, "buried with Him in Baptism," shows that the *Spiritual* circumcision *now* has its Symbol in the Baptismal *Water*, instead of the Baptismal *blood*; and therefore, that, as the *literal* circumcision was the Seal of the Covenant under the Old Dispensation, so now, with a change of *form* only, the *literal* Baptism is the Seal of the same Covenant under the New; so that, in Truth, Baptism may now be called, "The circumcision of Christ;" or Christian circumcision.

Finally, under the Gospel, the *subjects* of the Covenant remain *unchanged*. They are still the *people* of God and their *little ones*. This completes the chain of correspondences. As a *nation*, it is true, the Jews have been "cut off" from the Root of "the good olive-tree," and the Gentiles "grafted in." But then, as *Individuals*, even the Jews have not been so "cast away" as necessarily to perish. The only change, then, in this respect,

which has been made, is rather an *enlargement* of the field, around which the inclosure of the Covenant has been thrown. Christ did not cut off the Jew, his own kindred according to the flesh, from the hope of final salvation ; He did but cut off the nation from the *exclusive* possession and enjoyment of the *means* of that salvation. When His Cross came down, it fell on the old wall of Separation and made a great breach ; and through that breach, the Church, and Covenant, and promises, and offers, and calls of God and His Gospel passed out from their former narrow confinement, and with steady goings went forth to compass the whole earth for Christ as His well-purchased Inheritance. I repeat, then, even the *subjects* of the Covenant remain unchanged. They are still the *people* of God and their *little ones*. These latter are surely as capable of being *taken* into Covenant with God *now*, as they were of *old*. The act does not consist, and never did consist, in Infants' voluntarily and intelligently making a covenant with God ; it consists, and always has consisted, in His sovereignly and graciously *taking them* within the embrace of His Covenant, and pledging to them all His blessings on the conditions annexed. He does not now, any more than of old, ask Infants whether they can comprehend, or will comply with, His act ; but He mercifully *takes* them within the Sacred inclos-

ure ; and there does for them what belongs to Him towards training them, with opening accountability, for Himself and for Heaven. They are, therefore, still included within the Covenant of grace. They are capable of being made subjects of the promise, that, upon repentance and faith, God will forgive them all sin, and bestow on them the blessings of everlasting life. They are capable of being placed, in their earliest infancy, within the circle of His mercies ; that peculiar circle, where His mercies live most *vitally* and fill all means with their *best* power. Infants, it is true, are not in the New Testament, as in the Old, specifically mentioned among the subjects of the Covenanting rite. But, neither are Adults thus distinguished from Infants. And the silence has, in both cases, the best of reasons. The subjects of the Seal were well known. That Seal had always been applied to Infants as well as to adults. And now, the change in the mere form of the Seal, while the significancy and effect of it, and all else about the Covenant, remained unchanged, did not render it necessary, we may rather say did not render it *proper*, either to *change*, or to specify *anew*, the subjects, to whom it was to be applied. At first, when the Gospel began to be preached, the Seal would naturally be applied to adults only, because these only could at first be the subjects of Christ's teachings. But,

afterwards, when *households* grew up in the Christian Church, and whole households were baptized together, then past, all doubt, the Covenant gathered its subjects as of old, and fixed its Seal on the *Infant Seed* of God's people, as well as on those Adults, who might be gathered in from the world. Confirmatory of the truth of this view, Ecclesiastical History has ever been one long-lived commentary.

Baptism, then, is a *covenanting* and *sealing* rite. But what means this *sealing* of the Covenant in Baptism? This is a point of deep importance; since at this point the advocates of Baptismal Regeneration begin to develop distinctly the genius of their Theory. Baptism, say they, *conveys* remission of sin. But this is a vital error. The difference between conveying and sealing is essential; for, though this difference were at first but a point, yet it is a point of *divergence*, and therefore generates at last an *infinite* result, inasmuch as the two systems, which start from that point, according as each takes one of the divergent lines, become, at length, separated by a difference which is heaven-wide! *Sealing* is a sign used in *conveyancing*; yet conveyance and sealing are not one and the same thing. In the present case, conveyance is the gracious act of Him, who really imparts, actually conveys, Divine blessings. Sealing is "a

token," "a sign ;" "a pledge," which He vouchsafes and by which He certifies to us His Truth, His fidelity to His promises, and to the conditions, on which those promises rest. The blessings are not *conveyed* by the seal. They were not so conveyed under the old Dispensation. They are not under the new. They never are conveyed, until the conditions, on which they rest, are *met*. They are signified, they are sealed, they are pledged ; and of their certainty, so far as God is concerned, we are assured ; and thus we are encouraged and incited to diligence and fidelity on our part in meeting the conditions, on which they are signified, sealed and pledged. In accordance with this, our Catechism says, in defining a Sacrament, it is "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace ;" and that, as before explained, it is not only "a *means*,"—one of a grand system of means,— "whereby we receive the same," but also, "a *pledge* to assure us thereof." But, to say that the *blessings* of the covenant are conveyed by the *seal* of the covenant, is to begin building, on a foundation of error, a structure of superstition, a religion of blind homage to outward signs, which will, in all probability, leave the soul famished for lack of the inward substance.

But, if the pardon of sin is not conveyed by Baptism, what are we to understand by such texts as

these? "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts, 2 : 38. "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts, 22 : 16. And what is meant by the Article in the Nicene Creed, as grounded on these texts; "I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins?" In reaching an answer to these questions, I remark, that, in Acts, 2 : 38, Peter does not say, to his countrymen, "Be *baptized* for the Remission of sins:" his words are, "Be baptized in the Name of *Jesus Christ* for the Remission of sins." Nor, in Acts, 22 : 16, does Ananias say to Paul, "Wash away thy sins by Baptism;"—his language is, "Be baptized and wash away thy sins, having called on the name of the Lord:"—that is,—to get at the order of things,—“Having first called in faith on the name of the Lord, be baptized and wash away thy sins.” This is not hypercriticism. The difference between the two forms of expression is material. Remission of sin is really the gift of God to them that *believe* on the name of the Lord Jesus; and this, in all such passages as those just cited, is always implied and to be understood. It is “the blood of Jesus Christ that cleanses,” or “washes away,” “all sin.” *Faith*, “calling on the name of the Lord” Jesus Christ, is the true receiver, to which remission of sin is actually con-

veyed ; and Baptism, as we have seen, is but the *Seal* of the covenant, the promise, the oath, that the grant shall be, and actually is, made when the specified condition is met, and not before. Peter directed his countrymen to be baptized “ *in the name of Jesus Christ*, for the remission of sins ;” that is, to be baptized in token of their *faith* in that Name, and as a sign from God that, to their faith in that name, was granted the remission which they needed. And Ananias exhorted Paul to be baptized and wash away his sins, having first, by faith, “ called on the name of the Lord ;” in other words, to receive the appointed *Seal* of that remission, which was really *conveyed* when he believed on that saving Name.

In explaining such texts, we should never overlook the Symbolic import of Baptism. As a Symbol of Regeneration, it requires either a profession by adults, or a promise for Infants, of *faith in Christ*. This faith, or a promise of it, is indispensable to baptism “ *in the name of Christ* ;” or to “ *calling on the name of Christ* ” in baptism. Baptism points to the true and only fountain of cleansing, “ the blood of Jesus.” It seals, in our favor, the assurance that “ in Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins ;” Eph. 1 : 7. When, therefore, in the Nicene Creed, as founded on such texts, we “ acknowledge one Bap-

tism for the Remission of sins," it means, not that Baptism actually *conveys* that remission, but that it seals to us God's *promise* of forgiveness on the conditions prescribed. The article in the Creed, may be thus paraphrased: "I acknowledge one Baptism, as a Symbol of purification from sin, and as a Seal of the *promise* of forgiveness on the terms of the Gospel," "repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ."

This explanation applies to an expression in the *office for Confirmation*, as well as to this Article in the Creed, and to the texts, on which it is founded. In behalf of the candidates, we call upon God, as having "vouchsafed to regenerate them by Water and the Holy Ghost," and as having "given unto them *forgiveness* of all their sins." This latter clause, it is true, may be explained on another ground; that the candidates, "being now come to years of discretion," and having been instructed in all the "things, which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health," are to be regarded, in the judgment of charity, as having realized in their own experience what was "promised for them in Baptism;" as actually having that "repentance towards God and that faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ," to which, under the Seal of Baptism, remission of sins was promised; and therefore, as now actually having that promised remission itself.

And this explanation embodies a most important truth. Still, the language in the Confirmation office couples "the forgiveness of sins" and "regeneration by Water and the Holy Ghost" in such a manner as to make it probable that our Church, in this office, regards the forgiveness and the regeneration as going together. Taking the passage on this ground, then, it is only necessary to add that, if I have shown from the Bible that the Regeneration in Baptism is Symbolical, and not actual, I have, at the same time, and by the same reasons, shown that the Remission of sins in Baptism, as connected with that Regeneration, is *conditional*, and not *conveyed*. I am willing that this explanation of the term, Remission, as connected with the reception of Baptism, should stand or fall with the argument on the subject of Regeneration, as demonstrative of the *nature* of Baptism.

The foregoing view of this Rite as a covenanting and sealing ordinance cannot be too well considered, nor too well understood. For, according as we view Baptism in the one light, or in the other, either as actually *conveying*, or as only sealing a conditional *promise* to convey the remission of sins, either we verge upon that system of Theology, which makes men virtually worship the Sacraments, while yet they live at ease in what are termed "venial sins," because they are taught that

they can, at any time, obtain a valid pardon through its priestly dispenser ; or we adopt that “ radically and essentially different ” system of doctrine : which, while it teaches us to reverence the ordinances of God, because they are His ordinances, and because they are full of unspeakably precious meaning and value, still works in us an utter loathing of *all sin*, because it is offensive to God, and grievous to that Blessed Saviour, through whose bloody “ stripes ” we profess to be “ healed,” and by faith in whom we have received “ pardon and peace.”

3. In the third place, as an Institution of Christ, and as an ordinance, through which He brings himself into action among His people, Baptism is an INITIATORY Rite.

And this is one of the things which lie on the surface, rather than in the heart of the ordinance. By Baptism we are brought into the Visible Church, and made “ Children of God ; ” *i. e.*, Children in His family on earth ; “ members of Christ’s Body ” in this world ; and “ heirs of His kingdom ” in the next. And His benign intention in this is, to gather around us, at the earliest period of opening reason, understanding and conscience, all possible advantages and favoring influences for deciding the great question for Eternity, whether we are also to be children of His family in *Heaven* ;

members of Christ's glorified Body in the world *to come*; and inheritors by actual *possession*, as well as heirs by conditional *promise*, of His *everlasting* Kingdom? To this view reference was made in explaining John, 3 : 5. It expresses all that need be understood by the second answer in our Catechism, where we say that, "in Baptism, we are made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven." And this view is implied in the last great command and promise of the Saviour to His disciples: "Go ye and teach all nations," literally, "make *disciples* of them," *enter* them into my *school*; "Baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" Matt. 28 : 19: "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved;" Mark, 16 : 16. In the case of Infants, Baptism is the first known act of God in drawing them within the circle of His gracious arrangements, made with a view to their possible Salvation; and in the case of adults, the whole testimony of the New Testament, touching this point, shows, as we have seen, that the first step after their renewal by the Spirit through the "Word of Truth," was their *initiation* into the Church by Baptism; upon which sometimes followed the extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghost: while always followed those graciously nurturing and ripening influences, needed to perfect them

for the "general Assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in Heaven."

In order to entrance into the Church on earth, it is not necessary, as the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration assumes, that a "miracle" be wrought in an outward ordinance, giving us beforehand the thing, and more than the thing, for which we enter that Dispensation of means. Nor is it certain that *all*, who, by Baptism, enter the Church on earth, will in fact, by inward renewal and sanctification, enter the Church in Heaven. God, as our gracious Father, has many "children" in His family on earth, who prove disobedient, and so incur His just judgment. There are many "members" of Christ's visible Body in this world, who resemble the unfruitful, because *dead*, branches of a Vine; and who will, therefore, be cut off and cast into the burning that awaits them. And there are many "heirs" of the kingdom of heaven, who, through a refusal to comply with the *conditions* of their heirship, will be *disinherited* and banished at last from among the true sons of God. All this comports, not only with the suggestions of observation, but also with the language of Scripture. Still, as a general fact, it will, I doubt not, be found that, among those, who enter heaven at last, after having become actual sinners, the great mass will be found among those, who having entered the Church

by Baptism, either in Infancy, or in riper years, have thus come within the circle of those gracious provisions, which God has made for their Salvation.

The question is sometimes asked : Supposing the case of two children in the same neighborhood, of similar families, of equal capacities, and with the same means of religious instruction, the one baptized into the Church, and the other unbaptized ; would the former be any more likely, as a matter of fact, to be saved than the latter ; or any more likely to be brought to that repentance, faith and holiness, which are necessary to Salvation ? This question, in a somewhat fuller form, has already been asked in this discussion ; but I repeat it for the purpose of saying that it does not touch the true point at present under consideration. We might, indeed, answer the question *affirmatively* ; and, in doing so, find ourselves sustained by facts. But suppose we were to answer it *negatively*, and admit that possibly the baptized child might become “a reprobate and a cast-away,” while the unbaptized was brought to Christ and made finally an ornament to His Church on earth and an inheritor of glory in Heaven ; still, this would not touch the real point now in view. The true question, here, is this : Whence come the *means* of that religious instruction, which the two children re-

ceive, and receive with such 'possibly different effect? Come they not from God through *His Church*? Would those means of instruction have been accessible to the unbaptized, if God had not organized His Church, and given it His Word and ordinances, and laid on men the work of dispensing them as His Stewards? What would ever have been known of Divine things but for "the Church of the living God?" And where would the Church have been without that Baptism, through which, as by an open door, God is continually entering its members in order to keep up the intended succession of the teachers and hearers of His Truth, and the designed perpetuity of the knowledge and worship of Himself? It is no answer to such inquiries to say that He might have done all this without a Church, and without Baptism. He has not chosen to do so; and therefore, to us, it is the same thing as though to do so had been *impossible*. Practically, the true state of the case is *this*: Without the Church, there would have been no *accessible* Divine Truth, no *acting* Divine Influences, no *means* of Christian instruction. And there would have been no Church without *Baptism*, as that gate of entrance, by which the Divine *succession* of means and influences is perpetuated. With truth, therefore, it may be said that, without Baptism, in despite of the solemn obligations of which the "rep-

robate and cast-away" child goes on in sin, the healings of the Spirit of life would never have reached and saved the unbaptized ; while, at the same time, even *his* salvation, though begun before the outward ordinance, is yet carried forward and perfected under those gracious means, to which adult Baptism has introduced him.

This gives us one of the strongest views of the importance of Baptism in general, and of Infant Baptism in particular. Can we be brought too early within that gracious circle, which, if it do not circumscribe, is yet most fully and vitally pervaded by, the influences and mercies of God for the salvation of our souls? As a matter of fact, does not God show His regard for the seal of His Covenant, as affixed in Infant Baptism? Can we tell how early the moral susceptibilities, reason and understanding may develop themselves? Can we, then, too early find ourselves, at this opening of our natures, with the Seal of God's Covenant upon us, and our young minds taught to look up to Him, and to see the God of that Covenant in every shining of His Truth, and to feel Him in all the down-pouring rays of His influence through every channel, which leads, from Him the Infinite, to us the finite?

4. In the fourth place: as an Institution of Christ, and as an ordinance, through which He

continues to bring Himself into action among His people, Baptism is a **BADGE** of our Christian profession.

And this is another of the things, which lie on the surface rather than in the heart of the Rite. It is true that Baptism is not characterized by any particular text as a *Badge* of our Christian profession. Nevertheless, this character follows from the nature of the case, and especially from the fact, already noticed, that, under Christ, *Baptism* takes the place of *circumcision* as a *Seal* of the Covenant of grace. Circumcision was the peculiar visible *badge* and mark of God's ancient people, distinguishing them from all others, not descendants of Abraham, and stringently holding them to fidelity to Him, who had graciously taken them to be His chosen race. As the new *form* of this Seal, then, Baptism has the same force. It marks the Christian people of God as distinct and separate from the world of the unbaptized, and most stringently obligates them to fidelity towards Him, whose glorious Name they wear, and to whom, by solemn covenant, they belong. Under this blessed obligation baptized Infants may be properly placed. As of old, in the case of circumcision, Baptism is the seal, not of their voluntarily and intelligently covenanting with God, but of His graciously and sovereignly *taking them* into covenant with

Him. He has most lovingly and condescendingly bound Himself to *them* on the terms of the Gospel; and to these terms, with all they involve, of holy faithfulness and obedience, He holds them in most sacred bonds. He does not ask them whether, in their Infancy, they can, or will, *consent* to these bonds: He *puts them* under the binding, as one of the most precious favors which He could confer. That He has a *right* to put them thus under bonds to Himself, and to treat them according to their fidelity, or their want of fidelity, to Him, no sane man will deny. But this is a low view. He is most *good* and *loving* in laying these bonds upon them; infinitely more so than the kindly wise human parent, who hedges in the path of a wayward child to prevent him, if *possible*, from plunging into irrecoverable ruin.

Nor are these bonds one of the greatest blessings to the Christian alone, as an *individual*; they are designed to be one of the best safeguards to the Church also, as a *body*. As affording ground for whatever may be needed of salutary, maternal discipline upon those, who walk unworthily of their Christian vocation, they are intended to be, to the Church, as a *whole*, like the wall to a vineyard, her security against destruction from the ravages of unholy principle and of ungodly example. Those, who walk unworthily, having been brought into her

fold by Baptism, and by that *badge* being still known, may be either reformed by her discipline, or cut off by her judgment. God hath given her this power of self-preservation for the common good of all.

All the views of Baptism thus far taken, as a *Symbol* of Regeneration, as a *Sealing* rite, as an *Initiatory* ordinance, and as a *Badge* of Christian profession, are expressly and fully sustained by our 27th Article. Read that Article attentively. "Baptism is not only a *Sign* of profession, or a *mark* of difference. whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a *Sign* of Regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are *grafted into the Church*; the *promises* of the forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly *Signed and sealed*; *faith* is confirmed and *grace* increased, by virtue of *prayer* to God. The Baptism of *young children* is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable to the institution of Christ."

The chief part of this Article is spoken of adult Baptism; though much of its language will apply to that of Infants. It goes the full length of all the views, which I have advocated, and it goes no further. It makes Baptism a *sign*, or *Symbol*, of

Regeneration ; it considers the ordinance, not as conveying the pardon of sin, but as a *Seal* of the *promise* of remission, of course on the terms of the Gospel ; it shows the Rite to be *initiatory*, as "*grafting us into the Church* ; and it pronounces the same to be, though much more than a *badge*, yet still a *badge* of Christian profession ; a *mark*, by which the baptized are discerned from the unbaptized. And when it says that in Baptism *faith* is confirmed and *grace* increased by virtue of *prayer* to God, it sweeps away at a stroke the whole fabric of the "*Opus operatum*," which has been so ingeniously and toilfully built up, and so industriously and superstitiously filled with the alleged miracle-working power of the sanctified and sanctifying water. "*Faith*," says the Article, "*is confirmed* ;" of course, then, the adult who is to be baptized, already *has* a faith, that may *be* confirmed ; "*and grace is increased* ;" of course, then, he already has grace, that may *be* increased ; but, even this confirmation and increase of *previously* existing faith and grace are not wrought by any marvel in the Symbolizing Water, but simply "*by virtue of prayer to God*." Evidently, this Article was framed as a flat contradiction of that Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, to which I have so often adverted.

5. In the last place, as an Institution of Christ,

and as serving to perpetuate a knowledge of Him among His people, Baptism is a MORAL MONUMENT, testifying, through all ages, to the identity of the Church and to the fact of a Revelation.

And this, finally, is another of those things, that lie on the surface and not in the heart of the Rite. This function of Baptism, it is true, is not found written in the Bible ; and yet, it is quite analogous to what *is* written of the *other* Sacrament, the Lord's Supper, when St. Paul says of it : "As often as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye *do show* the Lord's *Death* till He come ;" 1 Cor. 11 : 26. A similar declaration, and with similar truth, may be made of Baptism : "As often as ye do baptize in the name of Christ, ye do *show* the Lord's *Resurrection* till He come." The evidence of Baptism to this miraculous fact, as well as to the Death and Teachings of Christ, is of great value. It is an evidence that could not have originated in fiction, and that cannot be set aside by sophistry.

Here, then, is a grand *moral monument*, testifying, through all ages, to the Identity of the Church, and to the fundamental facts of the Christian Revelation. This monument must have been set up in the very age, when the Christian Church was organized, and when those fundamental facts of the Christian Revelation transpired ; and it must have been set up for the very purpose alleged ; for

it could not have been subsequently and fraudulently erected and established in this character, and in the reverent memory and universal observance of the Church, any more than we could now, or at any future day, begin, without detection and contradiction, to consecrate, in our nation's deep memory and universal observance, the falsely alleged fact that on the fourteenth day of April, 1865, a Northern assassin murdered the President of the Southern Confederacy at the moment when that Confederacy was triumphing over the fallen fortunes of these once United States! Baptism, therefore, is such a monument as I have described. It embodies an evidence to the Identity of the Christian Church, and to the fundamental facts of the Christian Revelation ; an evidence, which could not have originated in fiction, and which cannot be set aside by sophistry. More unchangeably enduring than the Pyramids of Egypt, this monument, like the solemn sister at its side, stands to testify to all the generations, which have succeeded, or which are to succeed, of the age, in which it was set up, of the Great Master, by whose order it was reared, and of the weighty facts, which He laid in the very foundation of His Church.

This view of the two Sacramental Monuments of Christianity is fully and ably given in that master-piece of brief but resistless moral demonstra-

tion, "Leslie's Short Method with the Deist ;" with this reference to which I close our Summary of what I have to say of the nature of Baptism.

I have shown that this Ordinance of Christ is a Divine Symbol of Regeneration ; a covenanting and Sealing Rite ; a Rite of Initiation ; a Badge of Christian profession ; and a moral monument to the Identity of the Christian Church, and to the fundamental facts of the Christian Revelation ; a monument indubitably genuine, and indestructible from generation to generation. And I have shown that, thus viewed, the Ordinance is, at least, all that our Church makes it in her chief standards of doctrine ; and that, therefore, this Church being our guide, we may reject that theory of Baptismal Regeneration, which has all along been kept in view, without leaving this prime Christian Sacrament stripped of its solemnity and importance, a mere soulless, lifeless form of what Christ intended by its institution. In truth, the view, which our Church takes of Baptism, while it is simple and Scriptural, is, for that very reason, essential to its true beauty, value and efficacy. To burden it with the thick covering, which the theory of Baptismal Regeneration throws over it, however reverend and awful the robes, in which it is thus designed to dress it, is but to disfigure Divine beauty, simplicity and life with what, in fact, robs it of all the really salu-

tary power, which it was designed to exert, and makes it a minister to dark and deadly superstition. Disencumbered and left as Christ left it, and as our Church finds it, in the Bible, Baptism commends itself to the Christian's warmest regards, and most reverential affection, as every way worthy of its Divine Institutor, and of the Divine End, which, in its Institution, He contemplated.

There is, indeed, one further reference to the subject of Baptism in the language—not of the Bible—but of our Church, which ought not to be passed over in treating of this very important ordinance.

The question is often asked, Does not our Church call Baptism not only “a *Sign* of Regeneration,” but also Regeneration itself? Does she not in her office for Infant Baptism, “thank God that it hath pleased Him to regenerate this Infant with His Holy Spirit?” And does she not in her office for Confirmation, declare that God hath “vouchsafed to regenerate these His servants with Water and the Holy Ghost?” And is not all this a proof that she really holds the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration in all its breadth and length? Does it not show that she really ties the birth of the Spirit to the Washing of Water?

To this questioning I reply ; that, doubtlessly, our Church *does*, Sacramentally, that is, Symbolically,

connect the Birth of the Spirit with the Washing of Water ; she considers the Washing of Water a Sacrament, or Symbol, of the Birth of the Spirit ; she goes so far as to say that the former is " a means," that is, one of the various means, " whereby we receive " the latter ; but, really and effectively, she does not tie the two together, any further than God ties them together ; she cannot tie what He hath not tied ; she does not tie them together in point of *time* ; nor does she tie them together in point of *effect*, as that effect is defined by the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, which we have been examining. What she really means when she " thanks God that it hath pleased Him to regenerate the Baptized Infant with His Holy Spirit," it may be difficult to explain to the satisfaction of all minds. Of what the Infant is *not* capable she has distinctly stated ; but, of what the Infant *is* capable, she has not presumed to define ; the most that she can be supposed to mean by the language, which she uses, is, that, in Baptism, the Holy Spirit effects, for the baptized Infant, all, of which, in Baptism, that Infant is capable. What that is, of which the Infant in Baptism *is* capable, different minds differently conceive, even while rejecting the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, as that Theory has been set forth by its modern as well as by its ancient advocates. By her language, she

cannot oblige us to receive what that Theory maintains ; nor *will* she oblige us to receive more than what one of her standard writers on Infant Baptism says, in explaining what the Infant is capable of receiving in that holy Rite.

In his "Conference between two men about Infant Baptism," Wall, after stating what the Infant is *not* capable of receiving,—viz: the gift of the Spirit, "working actual faith and repentance,"—adds: "but when God does apply the pardon of original guilt; does transfer a person out of the state of nature into the state of grace and of the Christian Covenant; does unite him as a member into the mystical Body of Christ, and accept him for His child; these things and these *promises* are spoken of in Scripture as done, sealed and applied to the person by the Holy Spirit. Now, of these latter an Infant is capable."—This view agrees sufficiently well with that, which I have taken, and which I have illustrated by the teachings of the Bible. In substance, it amounts to *this*: that, in Infancy, we are capable of receiving the pardon of original sin, at least in this sense, that the "*promise*" of forgiveness, on the terms of the Gospel, is then signed and "*sealed*" to the Infant for his comfort and assurance whenever he shall become conscious of sin against God; we are also capable of being transferred from that state of na-

ture, in which we are *out of* Covenant, into that state of grace, in which we are *taken into* Covenant, with God ; we are capable of being united, as members, to that *mystical* Body of Christ, which is His Church ; and thus, we are capable of being adopted as “His *children*” for our early training and discipline unto the new life of the Spirit “in all holiness and godliness of living.” Of all this we are capable in Infancy ; all this, therefore, may, with truth, be said to be done for us in Infant Baptism by the Holy Spirit ; and in *this* sense, all, who are baptized in Infancy, may be said to be *regenerated* by the Holy Spirit in that significant and sealing Rite. Understood in this sense, there is no insuperable objection to the phrase. The phrase, “Baptismal Regeneration,” by itself, or in *all* its senses, I have not rejected ; I have rejected those senses only of the phrase, which do not appear to be sanctioned by the Word of God. Our Church admits the use of the phrase ; and, in Titus, 3 : 5, the Bible itself speaks of Baptism as a *Symbolical* Regeneration : “Not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to His *mercy*, He saved us, by the *Washing* of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghost ;”—by that washing, which *symbolizes*, and that Spirit, which *effects*, our spiritual Regeneration. We take it for granted that, in the former part of this passage, *literal*

Baptism is intended ; and we hold that it justifies us in calling Baptism, a merely *Symbolical* regeneration ; for there is the same difference, in sense, between “the *Washing* of Regeneration” and a *Regenerating* Washing, as there is between a *sign* of Regeneration, and a *regenerating* sign. A *regenerating* washing would *effect* the new Birth. “The *Washing* of regeneration does but *signify* that the new Birth is necessary.

But, whether or not this be, to *all* minds, a satisfactory explanation of the language of our Church, just quoted, of one thing we may be assured ; that there is not only a justness, but, to us, Protestant Episcopalians, a necessity, in that great law of Interpretation, as stated by the late Bishop Griswold ; viz : that, in cases of apparent conflict, “the Prayer Book must be explained into an agreement with the Bible ; and not the Bible into an agreement with the Prayer Book.”—If the two *appear* to differ, much more, if they *really* differ, the human must bow to the Divine. It were impious to force the Divine to bow to the human. That this Theory, then, of Baptismal Regeneration, as drawn from the writings of its most popular masters, does, not only apparently, but actually and irreconcilably, differ from the sense of Scripture, is a position, which, as I humbly conceive, has been sufficiently demonstrated.

That many and great names, in times long past, and in times now passing, may be arrayed against the view, which I have taken of Baptism, I am well aware. But if I have succeeded in showing that the Word of the living God, and the general teaching of our Church, sustain this view, then, so far as names are of any importance, I may justly feel sheltered under those more mighty and more hallowed than all that can be brought for a different view, whether from the dim days of Mediæval antiquity, or from these days of strange, backward tendency towards a Mediæval Theology.

To say that the difference between the two views of Baptism, which have been presented, is important, would be weak speech. It is confessedly fundamental. It involves the vital interests of the Kingdom of Christ, and augurs, as the one view or the other shall prevail, either the return of a dun eclipse to the Sun of Truth and Life, or, the shining on, to a still more perfect day, of that glorious Light of the Gospel, which the best fathers of the English and American Protestant Episcopal Churches have held forth ever since the time of the great Reformation. It is—and *let this be well remembered*—it is in the view, taken of Baptism by the post-Nicene Writers, that the seed was planted, which, in the Middle Ages, produced the fruit of that giant-error, termed, in later times, *Transub-*

stantiation, with its *Sacrificing* Priesthood lording it over a superstitious people. The poison of that error hath, it may well be feared, made her, who tasted it first and has tasted it most largely, sick unto death. And it will be *in our view of Baptism*, if, indeed, our Church be destined to a retrogression so sad, that we shall replant the same seed of error, and reproduce the same fruits of Death!

PART II.



OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER I.

ERRONEOUS VIEWS—STATED AND EXAMINED.

FROM our deliberate and prolonged survey of the more ancient of the two great Christian Monuments, those significant memorials of Himself, which Christ hath builded within the ample enclosure of His Church, I come now to a survey of its somewhat younger, but more solemn companion.

As the monument of BAPTISM is built on the broad fact of our own "death in trespasses and sins," and on the coextensively broad truth, that we need a quickening and a rising to the new life of holiness; and as, from such a base, it towers upward till lost in the glories of our bodily resurrection from the dead, the final fruits of the great Forerunner's victory over the grave; so that of THE LORD'S SUPPER is built on the mighty fact of the Death of Christ, as a Sacrifice for sin, and on the correspondingly mighty truth, that, in Him alone, "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sin;" and, from such a base, rearing itself evermore from out the sad shades of

Gethsemane and of Calvary, it points away, till glorified in the profound upward depths of that light, which it pierceth before the throne of God and the Lamb, and gathers its most sublime impressiveness from what thus shines round its summit and streams from its pinnacle, the light of the soul's blessed Life forevermore.

Viewed thus, as to their significancy, these moral monuments of Christianity are vital things. He, whom they commemorate, and to whom they point, still liveth in them by the facts, which they Symbolize and by the truths, which they teach. Beautiful things are they in their significancy, and blessed things in their vitality. Enough to justify this we have already seen in the view, which has been taken of Baptism. Enough to justify it I trust we shall see in the view, which I propose to present of the Lord's Supper. For, whatever of later extraneous coating I may feel constrained to remove from this ancient monument, I trust God will keep me from that rudeness of hand, which would either touch its original outline, or disfigure its Divine beauty.

In what I have already said, in the Chapters, introductory to this Treatise upon the relation, which the ordinance of preaching and the Sacraments in general bear to the regenerating and Sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit; and in what I have, at

such length, added on the subject of Baptism in particular ; so much has been incidentally spoken of the Lord's Supper itself ; the principles, which, like a foundation, underlie the whole Structure of Sacramentary theology, have been so largely canvassed ; and so much light has been consequently thrown forward upon the subject of my present inquiry ; that it will not be necessary to enter, at so great length as would otherwise have been desirable, upon the question as to the nature of this Sacrament. In what I have yet to say, I propose, First, to exhibit the great seminal error, so livingly implanted in that Theory of the Lord's Supper, which has of late been widely adopted among us ; Second, to examine those passages of Scripture, on which this Theory is grounded ; Third, to place this Theory in the light of reason and experience ; and Fourth, to educe, from the Bible and from the language of our Church, the true Idea of the nature of this most precious Christian Ordinance.

I. First, then ; in order to exhibit the great Seminal Error, to which I refer, I present the following Specimens of the language, in which the advocates of the Theory in question express their views.

It is said that there is "a real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament ;" *

* *Tracts for the Times*, vol. 1., p. 193 ; N. Y.

that the Body and Blood of Christ are Sacramentally united to the Bread and Wine, so that Christ is truly given to the faithful :” “ His flesh together with the Bread, and His Blood together with the Wine ;” * that the “ hands ” of the officiating minister “ convey the Sacrifice ;” “ Our Saviour’s Sacrifice ;” that on which the Lord’s Supper is a “ Holy feast ;” † that “ every faithful communicant may be as certainly assured that he receives the Lord’s Body as if he knew that the Bread is substantially turned into it ;” ‡ that “ the nature of this mystery is such, that, when we receive the Bread and Wine, we also, together with them, receive at the same time the Body and Blood of Christ, which, in the celebration of the holy Eucharist, are as truly given as they are represented ;” § in short, that “ there is a true, real, spiritual presence of Christ at the holy Supper ; more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel Him with our hands, or thrust our hands into His side ;” and that, though “ this is bestowed upon faith, and received by faith,” yet faith does but “ open our eyes to see what is really there ;” and that “ it is there INDEPENDENTLY of our faith.” ¶ The presence is, indeed, Spiritual, not visible ; and our eating and

* Tracts for the Times, vol. 1, p. 199.

† Ibid, vol., 1 p. 28.

‡ Ibid, vol. 1, p. 205.

§ Tracts for Times ; N. Y. Vol. 1, p. 214.

¶ Pusey’s Letter to Bp. of Oxford ; N. Y., p. 86.

drinking are Spiritual, not carnal. Still that presence is not the mere Omnipresence of Infinite Spirit, realized by faith ; but the real presence of Christ's very Body and Blood, "independent of faith ;" and our eating and drinking are not mere faith in the Sacrifice of Christ, as offered once for all upon the Cross, and as repeatedly represented in the Eucharist, but a real reception of the very Body and Blood of Christ, as united with the Bread and Wine, and as actually conveyed by the hands of the Officiator, and received into the body and soul of the communicant.

I add a few further quotations from the writings of one of the most accredited teachers of this Theory, to show that the doctrine of the Eucharist, which I am engaged in exhibiting, is all that has now been stated.

In his celebrated Discourse on the Lord's Supper, Dr. Pusey uses the following language : "The Eternal Word so took our flesh into Himself as to impart to it His own inherent life ; so then, we partaking of it,"—(the flesh which Christ assumed) —"that life is transmitted on to us also, and not to our souls only, but to our bodies also ; since we become flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone ; and He who is wholly life is imparted to us wholly." * Of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist,

* Sermon on the Eucharist ; N. Y., 1848 ; p. 7.

he says : " According both to the declaration of our Lord and our faith, it is truly flesh and blood. And these, received into us, cause that we are in Christ, and Christ in us." * To the same effect, he adds : " Having received into ourselves, **BODILY** and Spiritually, Him who is, by nature, and truly, the Son," " we, becoming partakers of the nature, which is above all, are glorified." † Again ; having spoken of the effect of the Sacrament on the Saint, he says, of its effect on " the Sinner, ... To him its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer's very broken body ; it is His blood, which was shed for the remission of his sins. In the words of the Ancient Church, he ' drinks his Ransom ;' he eateth that, ' the very body and blood of the Lord, the only Sacrifice for sin ;' God ' poureth out' for him yet ' the most precious blood of His only begotten ;' they ' are fed from the Cross of the Lord, because they eat His body and blood.' ' He,' says St. Ambrose, ' is the bread of life. Whoso, then, eateth life, cannot die. How should he die whose food is life ? How perish, who hath a living substance ?" ‡

I add a few more quotations, to show that the seminal error of this Theory has not only been planted, but also begun to grow, in our part of the vineyard. The author of the Discourse, from which

* Sermon, p. 8.

† Idem, p. 9.

‡ Idem, p. 9.

the last quotations were made, alluding to that priestly act of Christ, by which the natural bread and wine become changed into His body and blood, speaks of His "Words, as the form, which consecrates the Sacramental Elements into His body and blood."* Consequently, those who are now priests under Christ, when they repeat that form, although they do not TRANSUBSTANTIATE the elements into the Body and blood of Christ, yet come so near that alleged miracle, that they CONSECRATE the elements into that Body and blood. And thus it happens, according to this doctrine, "that His flesh and blood in the Sacrament shall give life, not only because they are the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Word, who is life, but also because they are the very flesh and blood, which were given and shed for the life of the world."† . . . "For that, we are so members of Him, not by love only, but in very deed; mingled with that flesh, mingled with Him, that we might become in a manner one substance with Him, the one body and one flesh of Christ; and He, the Eternal Son, and God the Word in us, commingled and co-united with us, with our BODIES as with our souls, preserving both for incorruption;" . . . "descending to our nature, subject to corruption and to change, and raising it

* Idem, p. 10.

† Idem, p. 10.

to Its own excellences, and, by commingling it with Itself, all but removing it from the conditions of created nature.”*

Some of the foregoing passages are, indeed, the author's quotations from the post-Nicene fathers ; but he adopts them, as expressive of his own meaning ; and that, too, without abating aught from what might be their literal force, in consideration of the fact that, with those fathers, they may have been but strong figures, intended, with however ill judgment, to garnish and commend a true and salutary meaning. It must be confessed that the author's own words, as well as his quotations from the post-Nicene fathers, if these are to be literally understood, are sufficiently plain language, though they teach a doctrine, which is not plain. So far as such a doctrine can be stripped of ambiguity in expression, it is here made unambiguous. However incomprehensible the thing intended, the thing itself is not left to doubtful conjecture. The doctrine, which is unmistakably set forth in these statements, is not what some understand by “the Real Presence of CHRIST,” but that of the Real Presence of Christ's BODY and BLOOD IN the consecrated elements, as distinguished from what is meant by the Presence of CHRIST, at the Sacrament ; more explicitly than

* Sermon, p. 9.

this even,—it is the presence of that very flesh and blood, which were given and shed on the Cross for the life of the world. The change of the natural elements of bread and wine into more than **SYMBOLS**,—into actual **VEHICLES** of that very flesh and blood—is distinctly taught. The conveyance of that very flesh and blood by the hands of the officiator, and the reception of them, together with their symbols, not only into the soul, but also into the **BODY**, of the communicant, are expressly asserted. And the miraculous result of the Christian's being made literally a partaker in the nature, the substance, of Christ incarnate, so that there is a mutual commingling and co-uniting of His Divine and human natures with the Christian, and of the Christian with His Divine and human natures, is undisguisedly developed. In all this, it is considered as essential to a true and perfect Sacrament, that the very body and blood of Christ, as the things signified, should be present with the bread and wine, as the conveying signs of that body and blood; and that they should be conveyed by the hands of the officiator, and received into the **BODY** as well as the soul of the communicant, at the same time and together with those signs. If the language, which I have quoted, do not express the whole of the foregoing complex and amazing Idea, then words for its expression would with difficulty be selected.

How all this is possible, the advocates of the Theory do not attempt to inquire. They leave it as that deep, profound and awful mystery, which is involved in this holy Sacrament, and which gives it its claim to our deep, profound and awful reverence.

It is obvious to careful observation, that the single point of difference between the Theory, thus set forth, and that of the Church of Rome, consists in this ; that, according to the Romish Theory, the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament are transubstantiated into the very flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ ; so that, save in appearance, the bread and wine no longer exist ; while, in the Theory, as just set forth, the bread and wine in the Sacrament continue to exist, but are consecrated into **VEHICLES** of that same flesh and blood of the substantially present Christ. The Presence, in both Theories, is the same.

II. I pass now, in the second place, to an examination of those passages of Scripture, on which this Theory of the Lord's Supper is rested. In doing so, I approach a subject, which demands our most serious attention. We may well be careful how we handle a thing so holy with irreverent hands ; and yet we must be equally careful how we allow Scripture, in our interpretations, to teach what, according to the mind of God, it was

not intended to teach. The seed of what we regard as the error of this Sacramental Theory is planted, as we have seen, in the view, which its advocates take of the initiatory Sacrament of Baptism. But that seed has already grown so much and gained such vigor, as to call for solemn heed-giving "to the Law and to the Testimony." As we value our eternal weal, we must know whether, in very deed, the Word of God actually teaches the doctrine, which, on this subject, we see and hear inculcated.

I go at once to the Key-text, from which this doctrine is drawn.

John, 6 : 53-56. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him."

I call this the Key-text of this subject, not because it is that which should govern us in defining the doctrine of the Eucharist, but because it is confessedly that, which has given shape to the doctrine as just exhibited. Both the Romish Doctors, and not a few in our own Church, in-

sist that, in the above passage, Christ is defining the nature of this Sacrament and our act in receiving it. The *true* summary of the nature of this Sacrament is found in the Instituting words of Christ, as given by three of His evangelists. For this reason, and in obedience to the Canon of Interpretation, which I adopted in treating of Baptism, and which is equally pertinent in treating of the Lord's Supper, I shall reserve the examination of those Instituting Words, until I shall have collected all the light possible from other portions of Scripture ; I might more correctly say, until these other portions shall have dissipated, by their own light, all the darkness, in which they have been so studiously and so persistently wrapped.

I repeat, then, the Key-text of the doctrine of the Eucharist, as we have just seen it exhibited, is this passage in the Sixth Chapter of the Gospel according to John. Adopting here, as in the interpretation of John, 3 : 5, on Baptism, the false Canon of Interpretation formerly exposed, the Advocates of this doctrine everywhere *assume* that these words in John 6, were spoken of the Sacrament of the Eucharist ; and not only so, but also spoken *literally* and to be literally understood. And then, with their key thus fashioned, they go to the Instituting Words of Christ, and with that

key insist upon unlocking their sense ; or, rather, insist that the Instituting Words, as well as those in John 6, shall be literally understood.

The very first inquiry to be made, then is : Were the words, quoted from John 6, spoken of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and of our Sacramental eating and drinking? In those words, was Christ, in fact, discoursing of the nature of the Lord's Supper, and of our act in receiving that Sacrament? It may seem bold to ask such a question after its affirmative has been so long and so confidently assumed, reiterated and used as a point, which all the world must concede, and about which there could be no question. And yet, one is constrained to ask the question, because this assumption, is made in violation of a just principle of Interpretation ; it takes for granted what ought *not* to be taken for granted ; what—I trust it will be shown—is not the true sense of the passage. We, who live after the Institution of the Lord's Supper, have no right to assume that the words, which have been quoted, as they stand by themselves, however much they may sound like the language, in which we have been accustomed to hear this Sacrament stated, were actually spoken of it, and are intended to express its nature and effect. The principles of sound interpretation oblige us to go back to the occasion, on which those words were uttered, and

to the Chapter, in which they are found ; and thence to gather their true, their intended import. Back to that occasion, then, and to that Chapter let us go ; being careful to go in a real spirit of teachableness, a readiness to learn what the Great Master would have all His disciples to know.

Upon thus going back, then, the first thing discovered is the simple fact, a fact important as it is simple, that the Discourse of Christ in John 6, was delivered more than a year before the Institution of His Supper ; and some time before He had even begun to hint to His disciples the great truth that He was to suffer on the Cross, a Sacrifice for sin. In His school, they had not yet advanced so far as this grand culminating truth of His Gospel. They were, as yet, wholly ignorant of the manner, in which He was to effect the work of their Redemption. Nay, more ; we know that they in common with the rest of their countrymen, still labored under that fundamental mistake of the very nature of redemption, which led them to look for a marvelous *political* Deliverance, and for a glorious *temporal* kingdom, under the auspices of their beloved and mighty Master. They could not, therefore, have understood Him, in what he said in that Discourse, as speaking of His own Death as a Sacrifice for sin, and of their Sacramental eating and drinking of His Crucified flesh and blood. In

that Discourse, as we shall soon see, He was, it is true, teaching them that fundamental principle of evangelic truth, the necessity of faith in Him as a Saviour ; but of the peculiar aspect under which He was finally to present Himself to their faith as a Saviour *crucified*, to be commemorated in His holy Supper, He said nothing. In his words, there was not even a dim shadowing of that aspect to their minds. His speech was strictly general ; even more so than that of His Forerunner, the Baptist, when he pointed out Jesus to the people in those memorable words ; “ Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.” “ The Lamb of God,” they might easily understand, meant a *sacrifice* for sin ; and to “ Behold ” him truly was to look upon him not with the eye of sense, but with the eye of *faith*. If, then, Christ’s words in the passage before us may be assumed as spoken of the Sacrament of the holy Supper, with equal, and even with greater justice, may those of His chosen preparatory preacher be assumed as spoken of the same ordinance ; for they both teach the same thing ; while, in the language of John, there is a distinct foreshadowing of *Sacrifice* ; but, in that of Christ, not even the shadow of the Cross is seen. That is, in John, 6, Christ said nothing, calculated to reveal to His disciples the truth, that He was to offer Himself a sacrifice for sin. The truth is, neither of

these utterances was spoken of that ordinance, but only of Him, who came to be a Divine Saviour, and of whose sacrifice that ordinance was subsequently to be made a Divine Symbol.

Nor is this all. In order to be fully satisfied that these words of Christ do not refer to sacramental eating and drinking, we must go more at large into the occasion, on which they were spoken. and into the Discourse, in which they were uttered. In doing this, we shall see, not only that they were a strong *figure*, but also, that the figurative *dress*, in which Christ chose to clothe His thoughts, was suggested by something very different from the then future sufferings on the Cross, and the then future Institution of His Supper.

Our Saviour, we know, was wont to seize on passing, or on well-known incidents and objects, that, by them, He might the more impressively illustrate, and that, from them, He might the more easily lead the thoughts of His hearers to contemplate and apprehend, the glorious truths which He taught. Hence, the peculiarly interesting *dress*, in which so many of His parables and discourses appear. Hence, especially, that most striking dress, and that peculiar *change* of dress, in which His discourse in the sixth Chapter of John appears.—Let us take a few instances, in which this remark is illustrated.

When Jesus had cursed the barren fig-tree, and when the disciples marveled that it so soon withered away ; He seized on their remark, and on the excited attention, which it evinced, to direct their thoughts to the necessity and the power of faith, and to the still more marvelous things, which, through faith, they should be enabled to accomplish. Matt. 21 : 18-22. So, when He wished to correct the false inference of the Jews, that the greatest sufferers in this life are the greatest sinners, and to impress on their minds the truth, that repentance is equally necessary for all ; He seized on the incident, which they related to Him, of Pilate's massacre of certain Galileans while engaged in their sacrifices ; and on the well-known incident of the fatal fall of the Tower in Siloam on eighteen of the citizens of Jerusalem ; assuring them that their reasonings from such incidents were false, and that, unless they repented, they would, even more disastrously perish. Luke, 13 : 1-5. Again ; when He had just fed more than four thousand with seven loaves and a few fishes, He improved the miracle by way of putting His disciples on their guard against the false leaven of Pharisaic doctrine. Matt. 16 : 5-12.—Once more ; when the Scribes and Pharisees came and complained of His disciples for breaking the Traditions by eating, while they had unwashed hands, He at once took up the fact

and went on, in a severe discourse, to show them the difference between mere outward uncleanness and that inward defilement, of which they were themselves the subjects. Matt. 15 : 1-20. Still further ; when a chief Pharisee invited Him to dine ; and when "He marked how some chose out the chief rooms," or seats, at the feast, He seized on the incident, and out of it wove the dress of two parables, full of important instruction. Luke, 14 : 1-24. But, the instance, most exactly and strongly in point, is that, which occurred at Jacob's Well near Samaria, when the woman came out to draw water. Here, the starting of the discourse from the incident before Him ; the figurative dress, which His discourse drew from that incident ; the nature of the great truth, which He taught ; and the manner, in which He led the discourse from one change to another, until He had brought His hearer to a full knowledge of Himself, as the true Messiah, and of those deep waters of Eternal life, which He giveth, and of which whosoever drinketh shall be forever satisfied ; all are in full keeping and harmony with the origin, progress and character of the Discourse in the Sixth Chapter of the Gospel according to John, which I am now to examine.

ANALYSIS OF JOHN VI.

This Chapter opens with an account of Christ's miraculous feeding of five thousand with the five barley loaves and two small fishes. The sight of this miracle prompted the multitude, who witnessed it, to a forcible attempt "to make Him a king." But He withdrew from the attempt, first "into a mountain by Himself alone;" and afterwards, when His disciples had launched upon "the sea towards Capernaum," into that sublime triumph over the elements, in which, as it were, He trode the roaring waves into a lowly acknowledgment of His Godhead, by laying them and the winds that had raised them, into level and unopposing silence! The next day, however, the eluded multitude followed, "seeking for Jesus." And "when they had found Him," and had questioned Him as to the manner of His passage thither; then it was that He gave them the memorable reply, which opens at once the ensuing Discourse, and puts into our hands the clew that is to guide us through its succeeding changes: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did *eat of the loaves* and were filled." This is the very *generating* point of the whole figure, in which he proceeds to clothe His speech. "Labor not," He immediately adds, "for the meat, which

perisheth, but for that meat, which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give you ; for him hath God the Father sealed." His very first words were A FIGURE, drawn from His own allusion to their feeding on the five barley-loaves and two small fishes ; and His very next furnish the MEANING of the figure, and give us not only a clew to lead us through the successive changes of His discourse, but also a key to unlock its deepest teachings. "What shall we do," they again inquire, "that we might work the works of God?" Mark His answer. "THIS is the work of God, that ye BELIEVE on Him, whom He hath sent." HIMSELF, the Sent of God, to achieve the great work, and to unfold the grand truths, of man's Redemption ; THIS was the MEAT, for which they were to labor. FAITH in Him, as "the Way, the Truth and the Life ;" THIS was their sole RECEIVING of the meat so furnished ; and the figure, in which He called it "meat," was suggested by what had so recently passed before their eyes.

And now, with this clew and key, both to the changes and to the teachings of this all-important Discourse, let us advance, reverently following our Divine Teacher to its close.

Having proposed to the multitude the true MEAT, and called on them to receive it by FAITH in Him as the Sent of God, they at once asked Him,

“What sign showest Thou, then, that we may see and BELIEVE Thee? What dost Thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, ‘He gave them bread from heaven to eat.’” To this unreasonable demand of a sign such as might challenge their faith, when Christ was almost daily giving signs, which awed dumb nature herself into most profound changes in obedience to His will; and to their disparaging comparison of Him with Moses, as though the latter alone had challenged faith by his miracles; Jesus replied: “Moses gave you not that Bread from heaven,” of which I have spoken; “but my Father giveth you the true Bread from heaven: For the BREAD OF GOD is He, which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.”

Here we have the FIRST CHANGE in the figure of the Discourse; and we can see clearly its object, and how naturally it followed both from the opening allusion to the feeding of the five thousand, and from the allusion here made to the Manna. They were willing to make a temporal king of one, who could so easily feed and support conquering armies; but to His character as their Spiritual Messiah, their Saviour from Sin, they were blind. They wished nothing of such a deliverer, and were indisposed to listen to His deep and saving teachings. He understood their temper, however, and pro-

ceeded to manage it with Divine skill. He quickly checked their disposition to wander from the point, which He had in view, and gently drew them back to Himself, and to those deep truths concerning Himself as the true Saviour, which He wished to inculcate. At first, He had proposed to give them, not "the meat that perisheth," like the barley-loaves and the fishes, but "the meat, that endureth unto everlasting life." And when they turn disparagingly from Him to their own Moses, and talk of his having "given bread from heaven" to their forefathers, He seizes on the hint, and gives a CHANGE, not to the real drift, but to the FIGURATIVE DRESS, of His Discourse, calculated and intended to draw their thoughts still nearer to HIMSELF and to the glorious truths, which He was seeking to bring into their minds. "Moses, indeed, gave you manna from heaven ; yet, not the true Bread, which you need. This my Father giveth you for the Salvation of your Souls. THE BREAD OF GOD is HE, which cometh down from heaven and giveth LIFE unto the world." Still, He utters not the whole of the Truth, which filled His thoughts. He tells them, indeed, of ONE that cometh down from Heaven to save the world ; but He tells them not yet whom He means by that wondrous ONE ; His object being first to stimulate, and then to satisfy inquiry.

His object was realized. "Lord," said they,

“evermore give us this bread.” Their interest was awakened. They knew that the miraculous supply, which they had recently received, could nourish them but for the day. They would, therefore, fain know something of a bread, that could give life, and that could nourish that life evermore.

Here, then, comes the SECOND CHANGE in the figure of the Discourse, and, with it, the full truth, which Christ would teach them ; followed by a still fuller explanation of its meaning. He saw that they had yet false conceptions of the bread, which He offered ; and of the life, which it was to give. To their eager petition, therefore, “ Lord, evermore give us this bread,” He at once, and without disguise, replied : “ I am THE BREAD OF LIFE. He that *cometh* to me shall never hunger, and he that *believeth* on me shall never thirst.” But, though this was speaking without disguise, yet it was not speaking without a figure. The figurative DRESS is, indeed, changed ; but it remains still a figure. The summary expression, “ Bread of God that giveth life,” is, at this turn of the Discourse, changed to the still more condensed summary, “ Bread of Life ;” and the Dress, thus changed, Christ wrappeth yet more closely around HIMSELF ; that, if possible, there may be no further mistake of His meaning. “ I,” says He, “ am THE BREAD OF LIFE.” And yet, His meaning itself is not changed.

He is still but presenting **HIMSELF** under this figure, as the only Saviour of lost men, the only Deliverer from the curse of sin.

Hence it is, that with the same meaning, though in a slightly altered dress, He gives the same explanation, though in a somewhat fuller form, of that necessary act, by which sinners are to receive and realize Him as their Saviour. He says, not merely, as before, "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him, whom He hath sent,"—but, more largely, and with a stricter, or rather, more open, reference to Himself, "He that cometh to **ME** shall never hunger; and he, that believeth on **ME** shall never thirst." In other words, the great truth, wrapped up in this figure of the Discourse, as thus far taught and explained, amounts simply to this: "I am the Bread of Life; the true and only Saviour from sin; the true and only author and giver of spiritual and eternal Life: come unto **ME**, and believe on **ME**; and, in this very act of coming, or believing, you shall receive this Bread to your salvation: you shall hunger no more, and thirst no more; but be forever satisfied with the fullness of everlasting bliss."

And now, see how all this grows into distinctness in what immediately follows. "But I said unto you that ye also have seen me and *believe not*." I know well the blindness of the Jewish mind, which

shuts the true Saviour from its vision ; and therefore, earnest as I am to teach you the truth, I know that ye will not all receive it. Nevertheless, "All, that the Father giveth me shall come to me ; and him, that cometh to me, I will in nowise cast out. For I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him, that sent me. And this is the Father's will, which hath sent me, that, of all, which He hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last Day. This also is the will of Him that sent me, that every one, which *seeth* the Son, and *believeth* on Him, may have everlasting life ; and I will raise him up at the last Day." Here, I say, the great meaning and its explanation are seen growing into distinctness and fullness. Here is Jesus, the true and only Saviour, knowing who are His own and promising never to cast them out. Here, too, is Faith, "coming to" Jesus in the inner movement of the soul ; Faith, "seeing the Son," with a spiritual discernment of His true character ; Faith, in short, receiving Him, in that great act, by which the benefits of His Salvation are realized and secured. And here, finally, is the Life, in which the glorious work of Redemption ends ; not the life, which is supposed to spring from a miraculous commingling and co-uniting of Christ's incarnate body and blood with the very substance of the body and soul of the

Christian ; but that Life, which, actually having its root in *faith*, bides on through the grave, and, on the morning of the Resurrection, springs up into a plant of immortality, reanimates the glorious body, which the power of Christ has gathered from its sleeping dust, and, thus perfect, flourishes and is blessed forever with Him, who hath proved both its "Author and its Finisher."

But let us pass on through the Discourse. "The Jews murmured at Jesus because He said, 'I am the Bread, which came down from heaven.' Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it, then, that He saith, 'I came down from heaven?'" To this cavil, the patient Teacher replied: "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, *draw him*; and I will raise him up at the last Day. It is written in the prophets, 'And they shall be all *taught* of God.' Every man, therefore, that hath *heard* and hath *learned* of the Father, cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save He, which is of God; He hath seen the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that Bread of Life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the Bread, that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the

LIVING Bread, which came down from heaven ; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever. And the Bread, that I will give is my FLESH, which I will give for the life of the world."

Here we have the **THIRD CHANGE** in the figurative Dress, which Christ chose for His thought in this Discourse. After repeating, with a slight variation, the previous form of the figure, though without any alteration of its meaning, by calling Himself not only "the Bread of Life," but also "the LIVING Bread," He adds that this "Bread which He will give for the life of the World, is His FLESH." Nevertheless, this is but another new form of the figure. If, by the previous figure of the "Living Bread," He meant, simply, **HIMSELF** ; so, by this new figure, He means, simply, that this "Flesh" is **HIMSELF**. The one form of expression is expressly a substitute for the other ; and the latter is as much a figure as the former. When, after first pointing somewhat obscurely to Himself as "the meat, which endureth unto everlasting life," drawing His figure from the recent miracle of feeding the multitude, He changed His speech by distinctly calling **HIMSELF** "the Bread of Life," "the Bread of God, which giveth life ;" it was but a change of the figure from one form to another ; and a change very naturally suggested by the reference, which had been made to the Manna. So

also, here : When, after calling Himself again "the Bread of Life, the LIVING Bread," He again changes His speech, and says that this Bread is His "FLESH," it is but another change in the form of the figure. It is not a change from the figurative style of speech to the literal. It is rather a recurrence, from the incidentally suggested figure of "the Bread," to that first adopted when He bade the multitude "labor for THE MEAT, which endureth unto everlasting life." And the object of the change evidently was, as before, to wrap the figurative Dress of His Discourse still more closely around HIMSELF, that the murmuring cavilers might have no excuse for again attempting to evade the point of His teachings, by flying off either to Moses and the Manna, or to Joseph and the reputed human origin of Jesus.

That I am right in saying, that this is not a change from the figurative to the literal style of speaking is conclusively shown by what is said at the close of the Discourse. Many of the disciples, as well as the Jews, thought it "a hard saying," that Christ should "give them His FLESH to eat." But, what was His answer ? That part of it, which directly touches the stumbling-block, was as follows : "Doth this offend you ? . . . It is the SPIRIT that quickeneth ; the FLESH," the *literal* flesh, "profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you,

they are SPIRIT and they are LIFE." And this is but saying that the term, "Flesh," which He had used, and against which they had stumbled, was a FIGURE ; and that its LITERAL meaning would be PROFITLESS.

Although, therefore, the figurative Dress of the Discourse was again changed, yet the great truth, which it clothed, remained still unchanged. Christ was still but presenting Himself, though more and more positively, as the only Saviour, who had come down from heaven to open the way, and to bring the offer, of Salvation to a lost world ; while on the manner, in which we are to become partakers of that Salvation, this portion of His Discourse pours a flood of new and brilliant light. He had before explained that, to receive THE MEAT, which the Son of man would give, or, to eat THE BREAD, which, in Him, came down from heaven, consists in "believing" on Him, "coming to Him" by faith, or "seeing Him" with the spiritual eye. Now, He separates this act of receiving Christ still more effectually from that Idea of a mysterious commingling of natures, to which reference has already been made. Seeing the multitude disposed to cavil at His words, and to reject His claims, He addressed them in the important language already quoted : "No man can come to me, except the Father, which hath sent me, *draw* him. . . . It is

written in the prophets, 'they shall be all *taught* of God.' Every man, therefore, that hath *heard* and hath *learned* of the Father, cometh unto me." The Father "*draws*" to the Son by the power of "*teaching*," and they, who spiritually "*hear*" this teaching, and thus effectually "*learn*" what is taught," "*come*" unto Christ; "*believe*" on Him; *receive* the imperishable "*meat*," which the Son of man giveth; "*eat*" the Bread, which cometh down from heaven; yea, "*eat the Flesh*," which He giveth for the life of the world. All these are but varying expressions of one unvarying Idea—that of receiving Christ as a Saviour, or, of becoming partakers of the Salvation, which He brings;—and the Faith, by which we thus receive Him, or become partakers of His Salvation, is generated by the Holy Ghost amid the intelligible "*teachings*" of God, in the process of intelligently "*hearing*," and, in a docile and obedient spirit, "*learning*," the truths, which we are taught concerning Him.

Thus far, then, the character and meaning of this important Discourse are plain. Both the position and the design of the Divine Speaker are evident. He was contending (with a divine wisdom and skill, which nothing could resist, save that, against which he was contending), against the carnal blindness and obstinate prejudice of his Jewish hearers; and His whole object in the contest was,

to make them comprehend these essential and vital truths ; that He was the true Messiah, and only Saviour ; and that faith in Him was the only way, in which they could become partakers of His salvation. As He was not yet sufficiently near, in point of time, to the closing act in His Divine Drama, to feel justified in removing all covering from His speech, He expressed the former of those truths in FIGURES. The latter, however, He was ready to teach in plain language. Hence it is, that, throughout the Discourse up to this point, the figurative and the literal alternate,—and that, in most palpably unmistakable forms. When speaking of HIMSELF, as the partially manifested, yet still, not fully revealed, God in Christ, the long-expected Messiah of the nations, He calls Himself, by various figures, “The MEAT, which endureth to everlasting life ;” “the true BREAD from Heaven ;” “the BREAD OF GOD, which giveth life to the world ;” “The LIVING BREAD ;” “The *Flesh*, which He giveth for the life of the world.” But, when speaking of the act, or process, in which they were to receive Him as a Saviour, or become partakers of His Salvation, He describes it in plain language ; or, if some of His language on this point were originally figurative, still it had become so common as to be virtually literal. He describes that process as being “drawn” by being “taught ;” and as

a "learning," which follows "hearing;" and He describes the act, involved in this process, as FAITH, as "believing on Him;" as "coming to Him;" and as "seeing Him."

But, at this point in His Discourse, He changes His Speech even in describing this act; and, instead of calling it, any longer, "believing" on Him, or "coming" to Him, He throws this also into a figure, and calls it, "EATING the Bread, which cometh down from heaven." And thus He prepares the way for carrying this figure still further, and expressing the Idea of "believing" on Him, or of "coming" to Him, under the altered dress of not only "eating the BREAD, which cometh down from heaven," but also "eating the FLESH and drinking the BLOOD of the Son of Man." And yet, even this FOURTH and last change does but show, still more conclusively, the really figurative character of the main body of the Discourse; since to "eat the Bread, which cometh down from heaven," and to "eat the flesh of the Son of man," are undeniably the same act, both equally figurative, and both finding their literal sense in FAITH in the Lord Jesus Christ.

And now, having, with the clew put into our hands by the Divine Speaker Himself, threaded our way through the successive changes of His Discourse, and having thus, by the key furnished for

our use, unlocked the true meaning of His language ; we are at length ready to enter on that part of the Discourse, which remains, and which I have termed the key-text to that peculiar doctrine of the Eucharist, which I have drawn from the statements of its advocates, and which has obtained such wide currency in our Church.

At what Christ had just said about giving His "Flesh" for the life of the world, the Jews, with utter perverseness, understanding Him literally, or rather misunderstanding His Words, fell "to strife among themselves, saying : How can this man give us his flesh to eat ?" To this evidence of their determination not to take His meaning, or of their sinful blindness to that meaning, Jesus, not choosing to throw off its figurative dress, or rather, in holy displeasure at their perverseness, actually choosing to retain, and even to intensify, its figurativeness,—as, on other occasions, He chose out dark parables, "that, seeing they might see and not perceive, and hearing they might hear and not understand ;" replied, in continuance of His Discourse, and with a stronger figure than ever : "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last Day. For my flesh is meat

indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he, that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that Bread, which came down from heaven ; not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead ; he, that eateth of this Bread shall live forever."

After the remarks, which I have already offered, in tracing the Discourse onward from its starting-point, or its reference to the "eating of the barley-loaves and the fishes," the meaning of all this is, I conceive, no longer doubtful. It is a most strikingly figurative close of a Discourse highly figurative throughout ; conveying, indeed, the most weighty meaning, and yet, conveying it under the dress of an unquestionable figure. Reading it by the light already shed upon it, it may be thus paraphrased, and put into a plain, literal dress.

Verses 52, 53. "There is essential and infinitely important truth in what I have been teaching, and am now about to repeat ; and therefore, though ye choose to "stumble at the word," and to cavil at the dress, in which I have chosen to clothe my speech, yet I strictly reaffirm what I have said ; and, taking up the last form, which the figure of my Discourse hath assumed, I solemnly assure you, that, unless ye do what I have taught you ; unless

you “see,” or spiritually discern, “the Son ;” unless you are “drawn” to me by “hearing and learning” the spiritual “teachings” of God ; unless you thus “come” to me, and “believe” on me, as your only Saviour ; unless you thus “labor for the meat,” which perisheth not, and thus “eat the Bread,” which cometh down from heaven ; yea, unless ye thus “EAT THE FLESH AND DRINK THE BLOOD” of the Son of man, as given for the life of the world ; you cannot be saved : you give evidence that you have not that spiritual “life” in you, which hath its root in the very faith required of you ; ~~and that,~~ therefore, you cannot come to that eternal life, which is to follow the glorious resurrection “at the last Day.” *Verse 54.* For they only, who thus “eat my flesh and drink my blood,” they only, who thus spiritually discern and truly believe in me as the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, enjoy the consciousness of having this inward life now, or have promise of inheriting that eternal life, at the Resurrection. And this consciousness and this promise all enjoy, who do thus receive me. *Verse 55.* For “my flesh and my blood,” thus by faith received and applied, “are meat and drink indeed ;” my teachings rightly understood, and my Salvation believingly embraced, beget a spiritual life in the soul, which shall never be extinguished. *Verse 56.* He that, in the sense intended, “eateth

my flesh and drinketh my blood ;” he who spiritually discerns my true character, believingly “ comes” to me, and receives me as the true and only Saviour, he “ dwelleth in me and I in him ;” he is a living branch in me as the true Vine, and receives both the graces and the growth of his inner life from me as their true source ; he is a member of my Spiritual Body by the faith which he hath in me ; and I live in him by the power of that truth, which he hath received of me, and by the workings of that life, which is thus nourished from me. I live in him by the sweetness of those thoughts, which such a life hath of me, and in the comforts of that hope, with which such a life is inspired by me. I live in him as God liveth in all the thoughts of the godly. *Verse 57.* “ As the Father,” who is essential life, “ hath sent me” to be a Saviour ; “ and as I live by the Father,” through a participation in His essential life, and by having my holy humanity sustained by His power and fed by His Providence ; so, he that, by a true faith, receives me as I have taught, “ even he shall live by me ;” his faith in me shall, as a root, nourish in his soul a spiritual life similar in its holiness to that of the Divine nature itself ; a life, in its present spirituality, upheld by my power, and, to its final perfection, nurtured by my Spirit. *Verse 58.* “ This” is what I mean by all that I have been

saying ; by “ the Bread,” which cometh down from heaven, as expressed under the former dress of my figure ; by “ eating” that bread ; by “ coming” to me, and by “ believing” on me ; and this is what I now mean, under this altered dress of my Words, by “ eating the flesh and drinking the blood” of the Son of man as given for the life of the world. And if you have a right understanding of my meaning, you will see that, marvelous as was the supply of Manna, which God gave by Moses, it was, at best, but a perishable TYPE of me, and of the vitally nourishing truths, which I teach. Your fathers ate that manna and died : I give you a bread, which whosoever eateth, shall never die. They, who truly receive me into the faith and love of their hearts and souls, may drop their bodies, for a season, in the grave ; but, in their souls, they shall live on, in a most blessed life ; and, at the Resurrection, I will raise, and spiritualize, and glorify even their bodies, to be the appropriate and the immortal companions of their blessedness.”

I said, in opening this analysis, that, in all this Discourse of Christ, ‘ not a shadow of the Cross is seen.’ What I meant by the saying is now manifest. In this Discourse, Christ was undoubtedly bodying forth, through figures, a fact, which comprehends the great doctrine of atonement by sacrifice ; the all-embracing fact, that He came to save

His people from their sins, and to give them life, spiritual and eternal, through faith in Him as their Saviour. But, to His Cross and Passion, as the mysteries, in which his atoning sacrifice was to be consummated, though distinctly foreseen by Himself, He evidently was not pointing either the Jews or His own Disciples. Neither could have seen such a pointing in the Words, which He used. He spake nought of Death ; He spake nought of suffering. The figure, which he finally adopted, of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," He plainly drew, not from His crucifixion as then future, but from the miracle of feeding the multitude with loaves and fishes, as just past. Throughout His Discourse, it is clearly observable that, at each change in the figurative dress of His one thought, He does but seize and spiritualize upon hints thrown out by His opponents ; as, at the first assumption of that dress, He does but seize and spiritualize upon the incident of his feeding them with the barley-loaves and the fishes. For example : when they came seeking Him, after having eaten of His miraculous supply, He takes up that incident, makes of it a garment for His speech, and exclaims : " Labor not for the meat, which perisheth, but for that meat, which endureth unto everlasting life." Again ; when they seek to turn the point of His Discourse by bringing forward Moses

and the Manna, which he gave as bread from heaven, the great Teacher seizes on their allusion, changes the dress of His thought, wraps that dress still more closely around Himself, and thus seeks to prevent their escape from His point by exclaiming: "I am the Bread of Life, the True Bread from Heaven, the Bread of God, which giveth life unto the world." And finally; when He had spoken of giving "His flesh," that is, Himself, "for the life of the world;" and when they perversely torture His language into the harsh idea of His literally "giving them His flesh to eat,"—though of eating His flesh He had, as yet, said nothing—He again takes up their own language, changes once more the dress of His one thought, draws that dress more closely than ever around Himself, and, without deigning to drop His figure in accommodation to their perverseness, exclaims: "Even so; I will teach my truth in your own terms; most solemnly do I assure you, with a firm reiteration of my meaning, covered as it may be from you by its figurative dress and your own voluntary blindness, most solemnly do I assure you that, unless, in the sense, which I have repeatedly and even literally expressed, unless, as thus explained, you eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you."

The thought need not be followed again through

the remainder of the Discourse. My object, in thus recurring to it, is to bring out, into still greater prominence, both the figurative character of Christ's teaching, and the fact, that His figure originally, and the changes of His figure throughout, are drawn, not from the then future crucifixion-scene, but from the past miracle of feeding the multitude, and from the passing hints, which He took and turned to use from the cavils of His unreasonable opponents. The idea of "eating" His flesh was not originally His own, but that of the cavilers at His words ; and, like the phrase, "Bread from Heaven," was merely seized upon as a new form to the figurative dress of the one, great, all-pervading thought of His Discourse. He was teaching the doctrine of Salvation by faith in Him as a living Saviour, and illustrating it by past and passing incidents ; not pointing forward to a future crucifixion, as the mystery, in which His work of Atonement was to be consummated. I repeat, then, in this Discourse, the shadow of the Cross is not seen. He spake no word here of Death, no word here of Suffering. HIMSELF, sent and come for the Life of the world through FAITH, this was the simple burden of His teaching ; and the DRESS, in which He clothed it, He took from His recent feeding-miracle, and did but draw it closer and closer around Himself at every attempt of His opponents to tear it off.

There is one circumstance, of decisive critical value, to which I have not yet adverted, and which confirms the view just given, that the one thought, which has been brought out, runs throughout the Discourse, and lies under all the forms, which the figure in the Discourse assumes. At its very opening, Christ says: "Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat," *βρωσιν*, "which endureth unto everlasting life." v. 27. Just before the close, after His Discourse had assumed the last form of its figure, He adds, with unmistakable recurrence to what He had said in the opening: "My FLESH is the true MEAT," *βρωσις*. v. 55: thus showing that, under all changes of dress, He had carried throughout His Discourse ONE unchanged meaning. At the opening, "The Meat," for which the Jews were exhorted to "labor," was undeniably a figure of HIMSELF, in whom they were called to "believe" unto life. At the close, "The Flesh," which they were required to "eat," is as undeniably a figure of Himself, whom they were called to receive unto salvation by *faith*. The figurative "MEAT," *βρωσις*, in the former passage, is, by the Divine Speakèr himself, translated into the figurative "Flesh," *σὰρξ*,—*βρωσιν*, in the latter.

The same thing is evident in the recurrence, at the very close of the Discourse, of another term,

which He had used near its opening. In v. 32, *et seq.*, He took up the allusion to the "Manna," and called Himself "The Bread of Life," ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, in reference to "the true Bread from Heaven." In v. 58, He says of His "Flesh," "This is that Bread," οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος, &c., "which came down from Heaven."

These two correspondences are a double chain, linking all the figurative parts of the Discourse together, and, in fact, making them all but a single Dress, though of several folds, inwrapping the ONE vital body of truth; which Christ sought to illustrate and commend to the understanding and the faith of His hearers. Whether, at the opening of His Discourse, He exhorts them to "labor for that MEAT" which Himself would give; and then, near its close, says that His "Flesh is the TRUE MEAT;" or whether, near its opening, He calls Himself "THE BREAD OF LIFE, that came down from heaven;" and then, at its close, says that "His 'FLESH' is THAT BREAD;" He equally shows that, while the figure is manifold, the thought is one: His FLESH, HIMSELF, given for the life of the world through FAITH. Or, to state the doctrine of the Discourse somewhat more fully, the Divine Teacher may be considered as saying: "As the Son of God, I am come into the world to be the Bread of Life, the true and only Saviour from sin. Without me there can be

no salvation. Without "coming" to me, therefore, and "believing" on me, no hearer of the Gospel can receive the Salvation, which I bring. And whosoever, under the "drawing" and "teaching" of my Divine Father, thus comes and believes, wherever his lot may be cast and however destitute of outward privileges, be he Jew or Gentile, has, by that faith in me, eternal life ; and, continuing steadfast in his faith, shall never perish."

Here, indeed, we have a truth, which lies at the very heart of the Gospel ; which makes this Gospel what its name signifies, "glad Tidings ;" and which pours into the evangelic Temple a glory, that outshines all other glories ; but, we have not one word about the Sacrament ; not one word, to divert our thoughts from Christ Himself to any outward Rite, in which His atoning Sacrifice, when accomplished, might subsequently be symbolized. If, in all He said, Christ drew His manifold Figure from past and passing incidents, and not from a then future Crucifixion scene ; it is most manifest that there cannot be, in the last paragraph, that key-text to the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as I have exhibited it from the writings of its Advocates, any allusion to what that doctrine terms "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ," as conveyed in and by the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, and by the hands of him, who dispenses those ele-

ments. If Christ's Discourse drew not its dress from a then future Cross, then this dress cannot cover the meaning of Sacramental eating and drinking ; for this sacramental act lives only in sight and at the foot of the Cross. If His hearers could not have seen, through His words, even a shadow of the Cross, neither can we make His Words teach even the shadow of such a Doctrine as has been fashioned of the Sacrament of the Cross. The Sixth Chapter of John, though it luminously displays the Gospel of Christ, yet has nothing to do with the nature of the Lord's Supper. Its 53d and three following verses are wrongly quoted, when they are brought to illustrate this point. There is no ultimate reason, or authority for thus quoting them but naked assumption ; and this assumption, by how many Post-Nicene writers soever it may have been made, cannot bear the intense light, which pours against it from the very centre of the Divine record itself. If my object required, and the limits assigned to this Treatise admitted, it would be easy to show that the view, which I have taken of this chapter is fairly consonant with the Theology of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and substantially sustained by the authority of the best standard Biblical Interpreters in our own Church.*

* *Vide*—Part iii. of Dr. Turner's "Essay on our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum," published since this Treatise was first written.

My examination of John, vi, has occupied considerable time ; not so much, however, as the importance of its subject would have justified. I have not attempted a minute analysis, nor an exhaustive commentary ; but such an analysis only of the Discourse into its principal parts, and such a commentary only on its chief truth, as were necessary to my purpose ; that of showing that we cannot have recourse to this Chapter, nor to any part of it, for an explanation of the nature of that solemn ordinance, which was, more than a year afterwards, instituted at the last Paschal Supper of Christ with His disciples. And I think, that all candid minds will acknowledge that the authority of Scripture, as it here furnishes its own explanation, is greater than that of any merely assumed meaning, however imposing be the array of names, whether from Middle or from Modern ages, upon which such assumed meaning may be thought to rest. And this would be the case, even were there no counter-array of names in support of the view, which I have taken. When the Bible clearly and consistently explains itself, its authority carries a power of Weight, which, at least with all sound Protestant minds, bears down, and sweeps away the opposing authority of all human names ; and the more so, when these names are gathered, not from the purest, but from the most corrupt ages and portions of the Church.

1 Cor. 10 : 16. "The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread, which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?"

My examination of this passage will be more brief. It is used, with no little confidence, by the advocates of that Doctrine of the Eucharist, which is here opposed. Dr. Pusey, in his famous Sermon before the University of Oxford, [N. Y. ed. p.10] when speaking of the cup in the Lord's Supper, uses the following language : "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the PARTICIPATION of the blood of Christ?" attaching to this participation the idea, which runs through his discourse. And speaking of the Bread in the Sacrament, it is said, in the Tracts for the Times, [Vol. 1, p. 205, N. Y.] "The Bread, which we break is the *κοινωνία*, or COMMUNICATION, of the Body of Christ; that, whereby His Body is GIVEN, and the faithful are made partakers of it."

This interpretation of the passage takes for granted two things of the utmost importance in this examination : 1. That the real Body and blood of Christ, as offered in "Sacrifice for sin," [Disc. p. 9.] are verily present with the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper. 2. That the word, rendered "communion," means COMMUNICATION, CONVEYANCE; and that, therefore,

the bread and wine COMMUNICATE, CONVEY, that body and blood to the faithful recipient.

But this interpretation cannot stand, unless it be first proved that the real Body and Blood of Christ, "the very Body and Blood" which were offered in Sacrifice for sin," are in themselves, as well as by their representatives, present in the Supper: nor, unless it can be proved that the Greek word, *κοινωνία*, really carries in itself the active sense of a communication, or conveyance. Neither of these things is expressed in the text; neither is proved by those, who quote the text in support of their Theory; but both are assumed as being the intended sense. This, however, is to assume very important points; the very points in question in this examination; the very things, which this examination is to settle. It is easy to say that a certain text carries this sense, or that; and if we grant it because it is said, we may, indeed, have an "end of Controversy;" and yet, in that "end," we may be as far as ever from the TRUTH. How are Christ's "Body and Blood" present at the Eucharist? And how are the Bread and Wine the "Communion" of His Body and Blood? These are questions, which no man may be allowed to settle for us by a word. We must look at the Scriptures themselves and seek to draw from them their own decision.

1. First, then, without anticipating what is hereafter to be said on the former of these questions, it will be enough for the present to observe that the passage, 1 Cor. 10 : 16, leaves the point untouched. It says that the Bread and Wine are "the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ ;" but it does not decide either what or where that Body and Blood are. We may have the communion of an **ABSENT** thing ; and if, as is said, "the very Body and Blood, which were broken and shed on the Cross," be here meant, we necessarily have the communion of things absent. That Body and Blood, in their *crucifixion*-state no longer exist : unless, contrary to what St. Paul teaches, "flesh and blood can inherit the Kingdom of God." The Body and Blood, which were broken and shed on the Cross, have been changed from corruptible to incorruption, and from mortal to immortality. They are become Christ's "glorious Body ;" His *Resurrection*-Body ; a spiritualized form, which is no longer natural "flesh and Blood." It is, indeed, Christ's Body ; yet, not that Body *as crucified* ; not that Body *as represented in the Sacrament*. Necessarily, therefore, if the "Flesh and blood," which were offered on the Cross, and *as* they were offered on the Cross, be intended in this passage, (and they undoubtedly are,) we have, in the Lord's Supper, the communion of things *absent*. And so we have,

let the passage mean what it may. That "flesh and blood," so offered, were the very sacrifice for sin, through which, by faith, we are pardoned and saved; and with them, in the character of that sacrifice, we are unquestionably concerned in the mystery of the Supper. But, then, it is with them as ABSENT, and not with them as present things. They cannot be present in any other sense than that of being present by their representatives.

2. As to the latter of these questions, How are the Bread and Wine the Communion of the Body and blood of Christ? I remark: The Interpretation, which renders the original of the Word, "Communion," by the similarly sounding, but not similarly significant term, "communication," is wholly unfounded. *Koinwvia* means "fellowship," "partnership," the "common" sharing of anything among several persons. It expresses the passive condition of an object, shared "in common" by a plurality of individuals; not the active sense of "communicating" that object. Even when the word means, "Beneficentia," "Elcemosyna," that is, "Alms," it does not mean the act of GIVING alms, but it means the SHARING of alms "IN COMMON" among the Beneficiaries. It means, in general, something possessed, enjoyed, "in common;" not "imparting," or "conveying." In this, its right sense, the word leaves the passage in

question without difficulty. True Christians in the Lord's Supper, have **FELLOWSHIP**, a share **IN COMMON**, in the very Body and Blood of Christ as actually offered on the Cross, a Sacrifice for sin ; but they have this "fellowship," this "common share," in that Body and Blood as necessarily **ABSENT** things, or as present only by their Divinely ordained representatives : And the medium by which they hold this fellowship of interest in the absent Body and Blood of their crucified Lord, is, as our Church defines it, **FAITH**. Here, as elsewhere, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Looking at its ordained Symbols in the Eucharist, Faith makes the Sacrifice on the Cross present, and enables the Christian to realize his interest in that sacrifice, as effectually as though he had been on Calvary when the cry sounded, "It is finished ;" and as though he had then laid a believer's hand on the very head of his accepted Substitute.

A company of men may have fellowship, a joint, or common right, in an absent estate, though it lie on the other side of the globe, and though no one of them has ever seen it ; and, when the sure and stated income reaches them, they are as well satisfied as though the estate itself lay at their doors, or as though its whole value were counted and paid into their own hands. The title Deed, by

which they hold it, is in their possession ; it is good ; no one can dispossess them of it ; and it is, to them, the visible evidence and representative of the absent treasure, which they hold and enjoy "IN COMMON." In like manner, the great company of faithful Christians have "fellowship," a joint, or common interest, in the absent Body and Blood of Christ, as actually offered upon the Cross in sacrifice for their sins. With the divine revenue of holy comfort, hope, strength and sanctification, which infallibly reaches them from their unseen treasury of blessings, they are sweetly satisfied. The Covenant, by which they hold and enjoy their common interest in it, is in their actual possession. The great Seal of that Covenant, in the consecrated Symbols at the Lord's Supper, is often exhibited before their eyes. And in this visible evidence, this sensible assurance, that their title is good, that "He is faithful who hath promised," their faith gathers its richest income of present and of satisfying benefits. Thus is it, that "The cup of blessing, which we bless, and the Bread, which we break, are to them "the COMMUNION of the very Body and Blood of Christ;" of the very Sacrifice, which was offered on the Cross for their sins.

The idea, which I have now presented of "communion," or fellowship, in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, as represented at the Lord's table, is, I

think, sustained by the CONTEXT, or what follows the words, which I have explained.

Having said that the Elements in the Lord's Supper are "the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ," the Apostle adds: "For we, being many, are ONE Bread, ONE Body; for we are all partakers of that one Bread." That is, "in this Communion, we, though MANY, are yet united into ONE "Fellowship," the mystical body of Christ; a union and fellowship represented by the ONE BREAD, of which we are all partakers, and which is, of MANY particles, ONE Loaf,—the evangelic "*E Pluribus Unum*." The Apostle proceeds: "Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they, which eat of the sacrifices, partakers, *κοινωνοι*, of the altar?" That is; have they not a fellowship, not literally in the altar itself, but in that, which the altar furnishes? In applying this argument, we may say, in like manner: "Behold Israel after the Spirit; the great company of faithful Christians; are not they, who eat and drink of the consecrated elements, partakers, *κοινωνοι*, of the Body and Blood of Christ? That is; have they not a fellowship, not literally of the very Body and Blood, which were offered in sacrifice for sin; but in what that sacrifice supplies; pardon and peace through faith, present adoption and future eternal life? Or, take the case of the heathen, as the Apostle goes on to

do : "What say I then? That the Idol is any thing ; or that, which is offered in sacrifice to Idols, is anything?" No. "But that the things, which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God ; and I would not that ye should have fellowship—*κοινωνοὺς γίνεσθαι*—with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." That is ; fellowship with Christ and fellowship with devils are utterly incompatible things ; and partaking, not literally of the tables themselves, but of what is present on the tables of both, is an impious profanation of Christ's ordinance.

In the language, thus paraphrased, it is worthy of remark, that, when the word, *κοινωνοὶ*, comes to be joined with devils, our translation renders it, not "partakers," but "fellowship." "Fellowship with devils" is an intelligible and reasonable idea ; but "partakers of devils," if intelligible, would also be absurd. The term, throughout the passage, should have the rendering of "fellowship," as more faithful to the true sense. Men may have "fellowship with devils," but cannot be "partakers of devils." So, the Jews had "fellowship in the benefits of the altar," but could not be "partakers of the altar" itself. In like manner, faithful Christians may have "fellowship" in the benefits of Christ's death and

passion, but cannot be "partakers" of the very Body and Blood, which were offered in sacrifice for their sins, and through the offering of which those benefits flow to the Christian's faith.

If, upon the principle of Dr. Pusey, the words, "communion of the Body and Blood of Christ," *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, are to be translated, a "participation of the Body and Blood of Christ ; then, on the same principle, the words, "fellowship with devils," *κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων γένεσθαι*, ought to be rendered, "partakers of Devils." The truth is, the proper rendering of each is as I have paraphrased them. The ~~former~~^{one} means, to be "the fellows," companions, of devils ; or, as our version has it, to "have fellowship" with them ; while the ~~latter~~^{other} means, "the fellowship of the Body and Blood of Christ." The former is that "fellowship," in which the wicked are influenced and governed by devils ; the latter is that "Fellowship," in which Christians are influenced and benefited by the Sacrifice of Christ.

This passage, then, in the writings of St. Paul, does not sustain that theory of the Eucharist, which I have presented. It is only by the usual way of ASSUMING a meaning for it, that it can be forced to speak the language of that Theory. The passage, INTERPRETED, speaks the language of the only sound Theology on this subject.

Matt. 26 : 26–28. “And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said : Take, eat ; **THIS IS MY BODY**. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying : Drink ye all of it ; for **THIS IS MY BLOOD** of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.”

This, with its parallelisms, is the only passage, which remains to be examined in connection with this Sacrament. It is that all-important Scripture, which contains the Instituting Words of Christ. There are, it is true, in the New Testament, some further passages, which refer to the Lord's Supper, besides those parallel with Matt. 26 : 26–28 ; but they are merely incidental allusions to it, or to the naked fact of its administration ; and contain nothing which can help us to an understanding of its nature. Thus, in one place, the ordinance is spoken of as a “coming together to break bread,” Acts, 20 : 7 ; and in another, as “eating the Lord's Supper,” 1 Cor. 11 : 20 ; the latter phrase corresponding with that, noticed a few moments since, of being “partakers of the Lord's table :” 1 Cor. 10 : 21. Upon such expressions, therefore, it will not be necessary to pause. The nature of this Ordinance must be learned, mainly, from the Words of Christ, in which it was instituted. To these words, then, let us now, with all earnestness, attend. I have

quoted them, as they stand in the Gospel according to Matthew ; but it is desirable to bring together the parallel places, in which they are given, in order to make out the full form of the Instituting Words.

The writers, who record these words, are the three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, and the Apostle Paul ; to the last of whom they were specially revealed. As recorded by these writers, they are substantially the same ; and yet, their records are not without slight variations. Thus : St. Matthew is the only one, who, in connection with the giving of the Cup, records the words concerning the Blood, that it was "shed for many for the remission of sins." The truth, however, here expressed, is implied in what the others record, in common with him, in the words, "Blood of the Testament," and "The New Testament in my Blood ;" since this New Testament, or rather, NEW COVENANT, *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*, includes the promise of "remission of sins." Thus, again, St. Paul is the only one, who records the important words, "THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME," in connection, not only with the giving of "the Bread," but also with the giving of "the cup." St. Luke records them in connection with the giving of "the Bread" only ; while St. Matthew and St. Mark omit them altogether. But, then, their record

by two out of the four, in connection with the Institution, and by that one, to whom they were specially revealed, in connection with both parts of the Institution, is enough to assure us that they formed a part of Christ's language at the Institution, and that they are essential to a right understanding of the nature of the ordinance. So, also, the first two Evangelists record, what St. Luke and St. Paul omit, the "giving of thanks" after Christ had taken "the Cup;" while, in like manner, St. Luke and St. Paul record, what St. Matthew and St. Mark omit, the "giving of thanks" after Christ had taken "the Bread;" or rather, St. Matthew and St. Mark say: "He took Bread and blessed it," instead of saying, "He took the Bread and gave thanks." But the same remark applies to this, which was applied to the last case. It is enough that any one of them records an expression, though the others may omit it. It shows that the expression was used at the Institution. Thus again: St. Matthew alone records, in connection with "the Cup," the important words, "Drink ye all of this." St. Mark merely says, "They all drank of it;" while St. Luke and St. Paul wholly omit the expression. But, then, the comment in St. Mark implies the command in St. Matthew; while the omission of it by the other two is no contradiction. So, again; the first two evangelists use the words,

“This is my Blood of the Testament,” or Covenant ; while St. Luke and St. Paul say, “This cup is the New Testament,” or Covenant, “in my Blood.” And yet, these are but slightly varying expressions of one and the same truth. And thus, finally ; St. Paul says : “This is my Body which is *broken* for you ;” while St. Luke says : “This is my Body which is *given* for you.” This difference, however, is immaterial ; as is also the fact that St. Matthew and St. Mark record the circumstance, that Christ, having taken the Bread and the Cup, “gave them to the disciples ;” while St. Luke records it of “the Bread” only, and St. Paul omits it altogether. It is enough that the main words in the form of Institution are the same in all ; and that, by comparing the four records, we doubtless obtain the whole of that important language of Christ, on which is based the authority, and from which we must deduce the nature, of this precious ordinance. This work of comparison has been partly done by the framers of our Communion Service. They evidently took, for the basis of our form of consecration, the words of Christ as specially revealed to the Apostle Paul, incorporating and harmonizing with them such expressions as are peculiar to one or more of the evangelists. As more fully harmonized, the whole form of Christ’s Instituting Words in connection with their preface and copulative phrases stand thus :

“The Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread ; and, when He had given thanks and blessed, He brake it *and gave it to His disciples*, saying : ‘ Take, eat : This is my Body, which is broken and given for you ; Do this in remembrance of me.’ After the same manner, also, He took the Cup, when He had supped ; *and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them*, saying : ‘ *Drink ye all of this ; for this is my Blood of the Covenant,—the New Covenant in my Blood,—which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.* Do this as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.”

The words in Italics show what is taken from the evangelists because not recorded by St. Paul ; while the beginning, the close and the general order of the form show that the framers of our Communion Service took St. Paul, rather than the evangelists, as their guide in constructing their form of Consecration.

It is not my purpose, at this stage of the discussion, to examine all the parts of this form of Institution and Consecration. This purpose confines me, for the present, to the meaning of the words, “THIS IS MY BODY, THIS IS MY BLOOD ;” since, upon that meaning the whole question concerning the nature of this ordinance turns.

From what has already been said, we can easily

anticipate the meaning put upon these words by the advocates of that Theory of the Lord's Supper, which I have exhibited. The notion, that the very Body and Blood of Christ must, some how, be received into the body and soul of the Christian in order to their joint immortal life in blessedness, having, in the growingly impure ages of the Church, obtained possession of men's minds ; and this notion having found the shadow of a covering in that strongly figurative language from John, vi., which I have examined ; this covering was, of course, brought forward from that Chapter and applied to the interpretation of the Instituting words themselves. Hence it was argued, that when, on the eve of His Crucifixion, Christ took Bread and blessed, and brake, and gave it to the disciples, saying : ' Take, eat ; THIS IS MY BODY ; ' and when, on the same occasion, He took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying : ' Drink ye all of this ; for THIS IS MY BLOOD, ' &c. ; He must be understood as saying, that, by the miraculous energy of His blessing, the Bread and the Wine, which He held in His hands, became indeed, not only the ordained signs and Symbols of His Body and His Blood, but also His very Body and Blood themselves. This was considered necessary to make His words true ; and to deny this was, then as now, by the advocates of the Theory, accounted daring presumption,

deserving excommunication from the Church. "Those words," said Dr. Cosin, Bishop of Durham, "which our Saviour used in the Institution of the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, 'This is my Body, which is given for you ; This is my Blood, which is shed for you, for the remission of sins ;' are held and acknowledged by the universal Church to be most true and infallible ; and if any one dares to oppose them, or call in question Christ's veracity, or the truth of His words, or refuse to yield his sincere assent to them, except he be allowed to make a mere figment, or a bare figure of them, we *cannot and ought not either excuse or suffer him in our Churches ;* for we must embrace and hold for an undoubted truth whatever is taught by Divine Scripture."

Now,—that Christ spake truth when He said : "This is my Body, This is my Blood ;" and that he, who charges the Divine Teacher with falsehood in these words, is deserving of excommunication, cannot be denied by any, who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. But, the real question, here, is, not whether Christ spake truth in those words, but, what is the truth, which His words contain ? The true meaning of His words, when ascertained, must be received by every Christian ; yet, not the less necessarily, must a false meaning of them be rejected. What, then, is the true meaning of the

Words : "This is my body, This is my blood ?" The right answer to this question settles the whole controversy.

1. In seeking for this answer, I observe, first, the notion of this Sacrament, against which I am contending, is, so far as it is drawn from these instituting Words, based on the assumption that the phrases, "Take, eat," and "Drink ye all of this," refer, not back in the sentence to the Bread and Wine, which He had just taken into His hands, but forward to His Body and Blood, which He was about to name. It is a notion, which requires us to paraphrase the language of Christ thus :—"And as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to his disciples, saying : "Take, eat my true and real Body. This, which I hold in my hand, has, by the miraculous power of my blessing, become that body." Then, also, He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying : "Drink ye my true and real Blood : This, which I hold in the cup, has, by the miraculous energy of my thanksgiving, become that Blood : " a paraphrase, which needs but to be expressed in words to be at once rejected ; inasmuch as it involves the plain impossibility that the yet uncrucified Jesus actually held in his hand the Body, from which He was speaking, and the Blood, which was then coursing through his veins.

It is very remarkable, that even Calvin, the Reformer, was still under the influence of the language, in which the Romish doctors had been accustomed to speak of this Sacrament. The following are specimens of his style of writing on this subject. Christ "declares that His flesh is the food, and His blood the drink of my soul ; and my soul I offer to Him to be fed by such nourishment. He bids me 'Take, Eat and Drink His Body and Blood,' which in His holy Supper He offers me under the Symbols of Bread and Wine ; I make no scruple that He doth reach them to me and I receive them." . . . "Except one presumes to call God a deceiver, he will never dare to say that the Symbols are empty, and that Christ is not in them." . . . "We most firmly believe that, receiving the signs, of the Body, we also certainly receive the Body itself." . . . "The Son of God offers daily to us, in the holy Sacrament, the same Body, which He once offered in Sacrifice to His Father."*

All this, indeed, differs essentially from the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation ; and is in truth susceptible of an explanation satisfactory to any sound Protestant mind ; and yet, like some expressions in our "Homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the

* Calvin's Works, as quoted by Cosin, Bp. of Durham.

Body and Blood of Christ," it shows how deeply the minds of the Reformers had, by long ages of use, become imbued with the language on this subject of an earlier and an impure age, even though they rejected the erroneous meaning of that language.

2. But, I observe, second, that the doctrine of the Sacrament now in view rests on another assumption ; that the substantive verb, IS, in Christ's language, has and can have no other force than that of its proper, literal signification ; that it means, and **MUST** mean, simply and literally, IS. Let us see whether this assumption has any ground of support.

It must be borne in mind, that the language, in which Christ and His disciples, as belonging, not to the literary court circle, but to the common people of Judea, were in the habit of conversing together, was not the Greek, in which the evangelists have written His history and discourses, but the Syro-Chaldaic, or Hebræo-Aramæan, as the then current dialect, that had come down to them, through the Babylonish Captivity, from their ancient Hebrew tongue. Besides other historic evidence of this fact, we have that of the New Testament itself. Thus, when Jesus met the persecuting Paul, on his way to Damascus, the latter "heard a voice speaking unto him and saying, in

the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Acts, 26: 14. Thus, too, when Paul would address and calm the excited multitude of his countrymen in Jerusalem, from whose murderous hands the chief Captain had just rescued him, he stood on the stairs of the Castle of Antonia, and spake to them, not, as the chief Captain expected, in Greek, but "in the Hebrew tongue." "And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence," while in their own familiar speech, he proceeded to tell the wonderful story of his own conversion. Acts, 21: 30-40. Acts, 22: 1-21.

Now, it is well known that the Hebrews and those neighbor-nations, whose languages were cognate with their own, although they had words, expressive of something like the sense of our verbs, to signify, to mean, to denote, to represent, to typify, to symbolize, yet rarely used them in discourse. When they wished to say that one thing SIGNIFIED, or REPRESENTED another, they said that the one WAS the other; nor, in saying so, were they at all liable to misapprehension. This mode of speech was peculiarly suited to the vividness of the Oriental mind. Their intended meaning was not only perfectly well understood, but actually made impressive, by the figurative boldness.

So deeply rooted in the genius of the Language

was the idiom, to which I refer, that I am not aware of the occurrence, in the Hebrew Scriptures, of any one verb, which has the sense of our words "to signify," "to represent," and their various synonyms. The noun, "sign," and its plural, "signs," carrying the sense of "miracle," "prodigy," "index," "military standard," are of frequent occurrence; but it has no corresponding verb; and even if it had, that verb would be of no service in the present inquiry. In the English translation, indeed, of the Hebrew Scriptures, there is one verb, which, if it had any correspondent in the original, would be of great importance in the case. It occurs in the following passages: "What *mean* these seven ewe-lambs?" Gen. 21 : 29. "What *mean* ye by this service?" Ex. 12 : 26. "What *mean* the testimonies . . . which the Lord our God hath commanded you?" Deut. 6 : 20. "What *mean* ye by these stones?" Josh. 4 : 6. "What *mean* ye that ye beat my people to pieces?" Isa. 3 : 15. "Know ye not what these things *mean*?" Ezek. 17 : 12. "What *mean* ye, that ye use this proverb?" Ezek. 18 : 2. That is: "What do all these things *signify*, or *represent*?" It happens, however, as any one who reads his Hebrew Bible will see, that, in the original, there is no word corresponding with our English word, "*mean*," in the translation. The questions are all elliptical, and,

in Hebrew, run thus : “What—these seven ewe-lambs?” “What—this service to you?” etc., and I presume there can be no doubt that if an Israelite were to supply the ellipses in all such cases, he would simply insert the substantive verb, equivalent to “are,” or “is ;” so that the questions, written in full, would read thus : “What *are* these seven ewe-lambs?” “What *is* this service to you?” etc. The truth is, as I have said ; the Hebrews and their cognates in language were not accustomed to use any verb to express the notion of “signifying,” “representing,” “symbolizing.” In expressing a typical, or representative relation, they ordinarily used the substantive verb which means, “to be ;” or, more frequently, made an ellipsis, which any Hebræist would supply by inserting that verb. Thus, when Moses would express the truth, that the Paschal Lamb “signified,” or “represented” the Lord’s Passover, he simply wrote : “It—the Lord’s Passover ;” or, without an ellipsis, “It is the Lord’s Passover.” Exo. 12 : 11.

In two passages, the Hebrew word, דִּבֶּר, “dixit,” “he said,” is, in its plural form, rendered into English as though it had the force of our verb, *intend*, or *mean*. Thus, when the tribes, which had settled west of the Jordan, were deterred by fuller information from waging war against those, which

had settled on the east ; it is said : “ The Children of Israel blessed God, and did not *intend* to go up against them in battle.” Josh. 22 : 33. Thus also, when erring Judah and Benjamin had been taken captive in battle by the army of Israel, and the advice of the prophet Oded had prevented the latter from making bondmen of their captured brethren ; it was said : “ Ye shall not bring in the captives hither ; for whereas ye have offended against the Lord, ye *intend* to add to our sins and to our trespass, etc.” 2 Chron. 28 : 13. But there was no need of using the word, “ *intend*,” in these two places, as a translation of the Hebrew, אָמַר. Josh. 22 : 33, would have been more intelligible to us if it had been rendered *literally*, “ The Children of Israel blessed God, and *spake* not to go up against them in battle.” And so would 2 Chron. 28 : 13 : “ Ye shall not bring in the captives hither ; for whereas ye have offended against the Lord, ye *speak* to add to our sins and to our trespass.” Even, however, if the primitive sense of אָמַר had been “ *to intend*,” or “ *to purpose*,” this would not have been the sense required in expressing the notion of *signifying, representing, symbolizing*.

To show that the sense, for which I contend, of the Hebrew Substantive verb is not got up to sustain a theory, or to avoid a difficulty, I will give a few of the numerous passages, in which it is either

expressed, or, though elliptically omitted, is yet to be understood. When Joseph was interpreting the dreams of Pharaoh, he said : "The seven good Kine *are* seven years, . . . and the seven empty ears *shall be* seven years of famine." Gen. 41 : 26, 27. When one of the heavenly ones was explaining to Daniel the vision, with which the prophet had been favored, he said : "These great beasts, which are four, *are* four kings. . . . The fourth beast *shall be* the fourth kingdom. . . . And the ten horns out of this kingdom *are* ten kings." Dan. 7 : 17, 23, 24. When Joseph was interpreting the dreams of Pharaoh's butler and baker ; and when Daniel was interpreting the various mysteries, which were proposed to him ; their language abounded in similar forms of expression. Gen. 40 : 12, 18. Dan. 2 : 37, 38 ; 4 : 20-22 ; 8 : 20, 21. In two of the passages here cited, viz. Gen. 41 : 27, and Dan. 7 : 23, the substantive verb is expressed ; in all the others it is omitted ; as it is in the language of Moses, when he says, "It *is* the Lord's Passover." In none of the cases, however, would any Hebræist, if called to supply the ellipsis, think of doing so with any other than the substantive verb ; especially as the inspired writer himself, when he speaks, as in two of the passages, without any ellipsis, actually uses the substantive verb.

This same peculiarity of the Hebrew language

manifests itself very strongly in the influence, which it had over the idioms of that particular form of the Greek, in which the inspired Penmen of the New Testament wrote, and which, by way of distinction, is sometimes called "Hebrew-Greek ;" because the writers, being mostly Jews, although they wrote in Greek *words*, yet instinctively abounded in Hebrew *Idioms*. The instances, in which this influence of the Hebrew of the Old Testament over the Greek of the New manifests itself, in the use of the Substantive verb to express the notion of signifying, representing, symbolizing, are numerous. I add a few of the more prominent as illustrations of the remark.

When Christ was explaining the Parable of "the tares of the field," He said to His disciples, "The field *is* the world ; the good seed *are* the children of the kingdom ; but the tares *are* the children of the wicked one ; the enemy that sowed them *is* the Devil ; the harvest *is* the end of the world ; and the reapers *are* the angels." Matt. 13 : 38, 39. When St. Paul was explaining the miracle, by which Moses gave the people water from the Rock in the wilderness, he said : "They drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock *was* Christ." 1 Cor. 10 : 4. And when Christ Himself, in the sublime visions of the Apocalypse, was explaining the mystery, which had been exhibited to

the beloved disciple, He said : "The seven stars *are* the angels of the seven Churches, and the seven candlesticks *are* the seven Churches." Rev. 1 : 20.

These references both to the Old and to the New Testament in illustration of the idiom in question might be almost indefinitely multiplied ; but they are already sufficiently numerous to show both the nature and the strength of the argument, which they furnish, and by which the meaning of Christ in the Instituting Words before us is demonstrated. In all the references, which I have made, the substantive verb, expressed or understood, has, clearly, the sense of signifying, representing or symbolizing ; and no Hebræist, who reads the passages cited, would ever think of understanding them in any other sense. To take a few of the instances as examples, their true English would run thus : "The seven good kine *represent* seven years ; and the seven empty cars *represent* seven years of famine." "The fourth beast *represents* the fourth kingdom." "The field *represents* the world ; and the Reapers *represent* the angels." "This *represents* the Lord's Passover." "They drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock *represented* Christ." The things were all significant, typical, or symbolical.

It is to be observed that all the instances cited, of the use of this idiom, and, so far as I am aware,

all analogous instances, are cases, in which some external object or rite had an internal signification that needed to be explained. In several instances, the question is asked : "What mean these things?" And the answer given is that of an Interpreter. Precisely analogous is the language of Christ in His Instituting words. He was, at the same time, instituting the chief external Rite of His Church, and interpreting its internal sense. "Take, eat this Bread ; Drink ye all of this cup." That was the external Rite instituted. "This is my Body ; this is my Blood." That was the internal signification of the Rite interpreted.

If, then, in all the passages cited, and in numerous similar ones,—scattered so profusely through the Hebrew and the Hebrew-Greek Scriptures, and opening to us one of the most deeply-rooted idioms of Oriental speech,—the true and unquestionable office of the substantive verb *be* that of an Interpreter of the inward sense of outward things, so that its real force may be expressed by our English word, *represent, signify or symbolize* ; by what law, I pray, or with what propriety, may we, or any other expositors, set ourselves at work to show that Christ, in His Instituting words, which are a perfectly analogous idiomatic expression, dropped the forms of His own native tongue, and assumed that LITERAL meaning of the Substantive Verb,

which obliges us to maintain that He was then working the impossible miracle of holding in the hands of His yet live, unwounded Body, not merely the ordained symbols of His great sacrifice, but the very Body and Blood that were to be sacrificed? Why put such a strain, such violent force, upon language, when the customary sense of the words is plain, satisfying and sufficient?

The Paschal Lamb, we know, was one of the significant types of the sacrifice of Christ. Hence St. Paul calls Christ "our Passover." 1 Cor. 5 : 7. By the same authority we are justified in considering the Rock, which Moses smote in the Wilderness, as a remarkable Symbol of Christ, The Rock of our Salvation, smitten for our Sins and pouring forth the reviving Waters, the never-failing stream of eternal life. 1 Cor. 10 : 4. If, then, the Jews should take the words of Moses, "This is the Lord's Passover," and argue from them that the Paschal Lamb was not only a Symbol of the Lord's act in *passing over* their dwellings and sparing their first-born at the sight of the blood, sprinkled on their lintels, but also, by a marvelous transubstantiation, His very act itself of passing over and sparing them;—or, if we should take the words of St. Paul, "That Rock *was* Christ," and argue from them that the Rock, which Moses smote in the wilderness was not only a Symbol of Christ, but also, by some mysterious

change, nothing less than Christ Himself:—it would be no more absurd than it is to take the Instituting Words before us, “*This is my Body, This is my Blood,*” and argue from them that the Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper are not only the divinely-constituted Symbols, or representatives of the Body and Blood of Christ, as offered in Sacrifice for our sins, but also, by some mysterious transformation, that very Body and Blood themselves! In truth, all this sort of thing is utter force on the natural and simple meaning of the established idioms of language. The verb, *is*, in all such places, has, not its primitive, literal signification, but its derived, idiomatic meaning; a meaning, which must have been perfectly well understood, when the Divine Interpreter uttered it; and the true sense of the language may, with the utmost fidelity to its spirit, as well as to its grammar, be thus expressed: “This Bread and this Wine **REPRESENT** my Body and my Blood;” “I hereby constitute these elements significant and perpetual **SYMBOLS** and **MEMORIALS** of that atoning Sacrifice for sin, which, on the shameful Cross, I am about to offer, once for all.”

Having thus carefully examined these instituting words of Christ, and having formerly given such a paraphrase of them as is required by that view of the Lord’s Supper, which I am opposing; it is now

proper to paraphrase the whole account of the Institution, as I have harmonized it from the writings of the three Evangelists and of St. Paul, in conformity with the sense, which is really intended to be expressed. Taking the whole together, then, this sense may be thus set forth :—

“The Lord Jesus, the same night, in which He was betrayed, took Bread ; and when, according to Paschal custom, He had given thanks, or pronounced the blessing over it, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying : ‘Take, eat this BREAD : this REPRESENTS my Body, which, as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, is, in the Divine purpose, already broken and given for your salvation. Do this yourselves, and enjoin it on my Church, as a perpetual MEMORIAL of me, and of my sacrifice for the sins of the world.’ After the same manner, He took the Cup also, when He had supped ; and when, according to the custom of the feast, He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying : “Drink ye all of THIS CUP, for this REPRESENTS my Blood of the new Covenant ; this cup is the seal and symbol of that new Covenant, which hath ‘force’ through the blood already virtually shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Do this yourselves, and enjoin it to be done by my Church, in REMEMBRANCE of me, for a perpetual MEMORIAL of my atoning death and sacrifice,

wherever, and whenever, till my coming again, that death and sacrifice shall be celebrated."

Separated from the body of the paraphrase, the Words, which have been more particularly examined, stand thus : "Take, eat this *Bread* : This *represents* my Body : Drink ye all of this *Cup* : This *represents* my Blood." This paraphrase makes the words, "Take, eat,"—"Drink ye all of this," refer *back* to the "Bread" and the "Cup," which Christ had first taken into His hands ; and not *forward* to the Body and the Blood, which He was about to name ; and this reference *back* to the Bread and the Cup, and not *forward* to the Body and the Blood, is seen in St. Paul's language ; for he does not say ; "As oft as ye eat Christ's *Body*, and Drink His *blood* ;" but, "As oft as ye eat this *Bread*, and drink this *Cup*, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." 1 Cor. 11 : 26. I leave you, then, to judge for yourselves whether the paraphrase, which I have given, is faithful to the true meaning of these important words of Christ.

I have already called attention to the fact, that, in all the passages, which I have cited, whether from the Old Testament or from the New, as illustrative of the idiomatic character of Christ's instituting Words, the Speakers were explaining something significant. I wish to impress this fact repeatedly on your minds. Christ was evidently

acting in a line with all this host of Scriptural precedents, and examples. In breaking and blessing the *Bread*, and in pouring out the *wine* with thanks, He, like Moses when He killed the Paschal Lamb and sprinkled the Blood on the lintels, had performed most deeply significant acts ; acts, which He intended His ministers to repeat "till His coming again." These acts, therefore, He must needs EXPLAIN. The mystery of the Paschal Lamb, indeed, had never yet been formally and verbally opened. For long centuries, it had stood, a mystic shadow, in a Dispensation where all was more or less significantly adumbrating. But now its significance was to be opened. It was to pass into a Dispensation of LIGHT. The shadow was to be lost in the substance. The CHRISTIAN Passover was not to live in DARKNESS. Christ would *interpret* it. He would pour light over what had been shadow ; to the end that what He was then doing might ever be rightly understood by His true Disciples. He took *Bread* and *broke it* : He took *Wine* and *poured it forth*. These were His momentously significant acts. Their explanation forthwith followed. Of the Bread He said, "This is my Body ;" and of the Wine, "This is my Blood ;" using a customary idiom of their native tongue, which His Disciples would certainly understand to mean, "This *represents* my Body : This *represents* my Blood."

They could not have understood Him otherwise, unless He had forewarned them that He was going to use the substantive verb in a sense altogether unusual in such a form of speech. Evidently, as a matter of fact, they did not understand Him otherwise than their every-day idiom required. Hence, before Superstition had crept into the Church of after ages, and, with her transforming touch, had wrought up a simple Divine memorial into a dark unutterable mystery, in speaking of the Supper they gather round it no words of dim and awful import; they call it, simply, "The breaking of Bread;" "The Lord's Supper;" The "Lord's Table;" "The Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." And, considering the work, which, in modern days, Truth hath wrought in unweaving the thick spells of Superstition from around this monument of Himself, which Christ hath left in His Church, I confess it appears a matter for profoundest wonder that any in our own Protestant Church, should be found eager to weave once more the fearful covering of mystery and of miracle, and therewith to enshroud again in terrible pomp these simple, precious memorials of their Saviour's Death and Sacrifice for sin. Through the clear light of our favored day, the very idiom of His native tongue sounds louder than ever, and, in most intelligible tones, rebukes the strangely unnatural

force, which they would again put upon His simple Words.

In what has now been said. the Scriptures alone have been taken as our guide ; and, in submission to their sole authority, there has been, as I hope, an honest and prayerful endeavor to understand them. As thus consequently understood, they are wholly opposed to the notion that, in order to salvation, it is necessary that the very Body and Blood of Christ should be literally given by the hands of His ministers, and received into the bodies and souls of His Disciples, along with the Divine Symbols, by which they are represented. On this subject, the Bible teaches no more than this ; that, in order to salvation, Christ, as an Atoning Saviour, must be believed in, loved, and lovingly followed ; and that, in the Sacrament of His Supper, we feast, in *common* with the whole *fellowship* of believers, on the constituted Symbols, which represent His Death and Passion as endured in order to procure the pardon of our sins and to render forgiveness possible to our fellow-creatures. For the contrary view no authority in the Bible is discoverable ; and, so far as human authority should justly have weight on this subject, its teachings must be received as addressed to that FAITH, which, in the Sacred Supper, sees the absent body of the Saviour as though present, or as present only in its

divinely appointed representatives and in its divinely communicated benefits ; to that Faith, which, thus seeing Him, feeds spiritually on Him, to the great comfort and refreshing of the Soul ; so that, in the language of our Communion service, we take and eat bread "in remembrance that Christ died for us, and feed on Him in our *hearts* by *faith*, with thanksgiving."

CHAPTER II.

REMARKS ON THE THEORY OF THE REAL PRESENCE.

IN what I have thus far said of the Lord's Supper, I have examined a view of the subject which is deemed erroneous, and the error of which I have endeavored to evince by a study of the Sacred Scriptures, so far as they relate directly to this Sacrament. I propose, now, to add a few remarks by way of preparing for a statement of what I deem the true Scriptural account of this divine Ordinance. I hope I shall not be thought irreverent when I add, that, in offering these remarks, I shall do what was proposd, in the third place ; viz :

III. To set the erroneous view, which has been examined by the light of the Scriptures, in the light also of REASON and of EXPERIENCE. For reason and experience are sacred things. Reason is that light, which God hath set in the soul, and without which we cannot read either His Word or His Works. And Experience is that Providential test, to which He himself brings, for a trial far from useless, the truth or the falsehood of all human theories. And

that theory of so sacred a thing as even this Divine Institution, which will not abide the test both of Reason and of Experience, gives at least one weighty proof that it cannot abide the higher trial of the Word of God.

Before proceeding further, then, let us once more bring the Theory in question distinctly before our minds. This Theory maintains that the very Body and Blood of Christ, which were offered on the Cross, as a Sacrifice for the sins of the world, are, in a manner inexplicable to us, really present in the consecrated elements of Bread and Wine at the Lord's Supper ;—that they are thus present “independently of faith ;” or, that, whether the communicant have faith to discern them, or not, still they are there ; and that the office of faith is, not merely to believe in Christ as a crucified and atoning Saviour ; not merely to contemplate the Broken Body and the Shed Blood of Christ as they were offered in Sacrifice on the Cross ; not merely to view His risen and glorified humanity, as it ascended into heaven, and as it remains there at the right hand of the Father ; but really to discern that Broken Body and that Shed Blood in the elements by believing those words of Christ, “This is my Body, This is my Blood,” which make them present ; and then, from the hand of the officiator, to receive them into the body and the soul of the communicant

“at the same time and together with” the signs by which they are represented. “Our faith,” says Bishop Cosin, “doth not cause, or make that presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the Word of Christ; and the faith whereby we are said to eat the Flesh of Christ, is, not that only, whereby we believe that He died for our sins,—for this faith is supposed to precede the Sacramental manducation,—but more properly that, whereby we believe those Words of Christ, “This is my Body.” . . . “For, in this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do, *invisibly*, receive the *Substance* of Christ’s Body and Blood, as much as if we should eat and drink both *visibly*.”

This view is not content with affirming, that Christ is present at His Holy Supper in His Divine nature; or that He is present to *faith* in symbolic representation, and by the special benefits, thus communicated, of His death and passion. It requires us to believe, still further, that His very broken Body and shed Blood are, however inscrutably, yet *really*, present with the consecrated elements; and that they are actually conveyed by the hands of the Officiator and received into the Body and Soul of the Christian at the same time with those Elements. And they, who urge this view, call the opposite interpretation, “which regards the conse-

crated Elements as visible symbols only of His *absent* Body and Blood," an "Ultra Protestant Theory." *

I. Having thus renewedly brought this view of the Lord's Supper before the mind, the first remark, which I have to offer upon it, is this.

It is based on the notion that *salvation depends on receiving into our bodies and souls the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.*

Its advocates contend that there must be, somehow, a commixture and co-uniting of His very Body and Blood with our bodies and souls in order to impart to our own the purity and incorruptibility of His ; a commixture and co-union, indeed, which do not take place by any operation of nature, but which, nevertheless, by some invisible and inexplicable process, are actually effected.†

This notion, as I have already demonstrated, is unscriptural. Receiving Christ, as Christ Himself explains the act, even under the strong figure of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," consists in "believing" on Him, being "drawn" to Him, "coming" to Him, "seeing" Him, with that spiritual discernment, which results from being "taught of God," and from having "learned of Him." Receiving Christ is FAITH, relying on His Sacrifice

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bp. of Oxford, N. Y., p. 96.

† Sermon before the University of Oxford, pp. 8, 9.

and Righteousness for pardon and justification ; with LOVE, walking in His footsteps and obeying His Word. It is FAITH, taking such a view of His nature and character, of His Office and Work, as to be thereby made partaker of the free remission of sin, and of free adoption among the sons of God ; and, through the accompanying power of the Spirit, to be influenced unto all newness of heart and life. It is FAITH, " beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord ; " finding this glass made most powerfully reflecting, when placed in the light of the Eucharistic symbol ; and thus most effectually changing the beholder, " into the same Image, from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord."

Receiving Christ in any other sense is as UNREASONABLE as it is unscriptural. Neither carnally nor spiritually is the SUBSTANCE of His flesh and blood, however refined, to be received into, and commingled with, the SUBSTANCE of our bodies and souls. Except, simply, as FAITH relies and feeds on His atoning sacrifice for pardon, adoption and eternal life ; and as thus, through the power of the Spirit, it brings His character into our characters, fashions us into a moral likeness to Him, and gives us herein the true secret of immortal life and blessedness ; except this reception of Christ, there is no eating of the flesh, no drinking of the blood of the Crucified. He gave His Body on the Cross, to be

a Sacrifice for sin ; and the Bread, BROKEN in the sacred Supper, REPRESENTS the gift, and the Sacrifice in which it was offered. He shed His Blood on the Cross for the Remission of sin ; and the Wine, POURED OUT in the divine Feast, REPRESENTS that Blood and the shedding through which it avails for remission. And yet, when we eat that bread and drink that wine, our act is but LOVE'S MEMORIAL, and FAITH'S RECEPTION of His act. We thereby "show the Lord's death till He come ;" while, at the same time, amid the solemnities of our commemoration, and through the sanctifyings of the Spirit, Faith feels a quickening as it feeds on the BENEFITS of His Sacrifice ; Love burns with an intenser flame as it REALIZES His Love for our souls ; and Obedience grows stronger with both Faith and Love, because the soul is *rapt away into heaven* in unwonted communions with her risen Lord, the now glorified Lamb of God. Except in such a sense, I repeat, neither reason nor revelation knows any thing of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ. The exercises, which have been described are, indeed, called a *Sacramental* eating and drinking of that flesh and blood, a *Spiritual* eating and drinking ; and yet, rightly understood, these expressions and those exercises of Faith and Love are identical. In sacramental, spiritual eating and drinking, we partake in Faith and Love of

that Bread and Wine, which are the divinely constituted symbols and memorials of Christ Crucified, and which are FIGURATIVELY called by the name of the things signified. They ARE not the Body and Blood of Christ ; they are but figuratively CALLED so. Hence our authorized "Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments" uses this well-known language : "If Sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things whereof they be sacraments, they should be no sacraments at all. And of this similitude, they do, for the most part, receive the names of the self-same things they signify." "From these words of St. Augustine, it appeareth that he alloweth the common description of a Sacrament, which is, that it is a visible sign of an invisible grace ; that is to say, that setteth out to the eyes and other outward senses the inward working of God's free mercy, and doth, as it were, seal in our hearts the promises of God." That is—The Bread and Wine SIGNIFY the Body and Blood of Christ ; and therefore, sacramentally, they are CALLED His Body and Blood ; and, sacramentally, spiritually, we are said to EAT and DRINK that Body and Blood. Our eating and drinking are a symbolic Figure of the act of our faith and love, in receiving and enjoying the benefits of Christ's death and passion to the "strengthening and refreshing of our souls." What Christ says, when He speaks of "eating His

flesh and drinking His Blood," was, as we have seen, not spoken of sacramental eating and drinking ; but, as He himself explained it, more than a year before instituting His Supper, it was a strongly figurative expression of the act of " coming to Him" in the obedience of submissive hearts ; and of " believing on Him" as the only Saviour from sin ; acts which every true Christian performs not only at the Lord's table, but also in other places, and at other times ; and which, if he would go guiltless, it much behooves him to perform, before he ever approaches that table.

In the early and towards the Middle Ages, figurative language, like that of Christ in John vi., was profusely used, accompanied with the most florid exaggerations, and applied to the Sacraments of Christ apparently with the design of exalting them in the estimation of a people, who had long been accustomed to the dark and hidden mysteries of Paganism ; and thus of meeting the charge that the NEW RELIGION was a naked system, with nothing of deep, interior signification. By this process ERROR was at length bred ; the legislation of the Church finally TRANSUBSTANTIATED the figurative into the literal ; and the notion, that the real Body and Blood of Christ are verily given and received in the Lord's Supper, took possession of the Church herself, and for ages ruled, without

open questioning, both the faith and the language of her millions. So deeply did this error infect the Theology and the modes of thought and speech of the Christians of the Middle Ages, that it continued to influence the phraseology of those Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, who were willing to go to the stake, and did go to the stake, for discarding the very error, which that phraseology had been accustomed to inwrap. And even now, those, who read much and reverentially the Theological Works of those ages of corruption, although such readers may discard, for the present, the final absurdity of Transubstantiation, into which the error ran, yet find great difficulty in dispossessing their minds of the seminal principle of that absurdity—the notion that, together with the elements of bread and wine, and by the hands of those who minister, the very flesh and blood of Christ are given and received into the bodies and souls of the faithful in the Lord's Supper. To use very modern language on this subject, language which I could not make my own without a shudder, Christ's ministers are "in-trusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's Body and Blood;" and this Body and Blood "in the celebration of the holy Eucharist are as truly GIVEN as they are represented." To the spiritually enlightened, as well as devout traveler into antiquity, however, who

leaps over that immense mass of scholastic subtleties, which makes even the truths of the Middle Ages dark, and who alights far back amid the unobscured truth and glory of the Age of Revelation itself, there is no difficulty in understanding that sacramental eating and drinking consist in simply receiving the divinely constituted Symbols, or Representatives of Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross with a living faith in the Sacrifice represented, and in Him who gave Himself to be that Sacrifice; and that the language, in which, long before He gave Himself up to the Cross, He spake of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," is but a strong, though vitally important figure for what He so uniformly inculcates, as the very ground of our hope of salvation, HIMSELF, the only Saviour of lost men, really received in the soul's act of "COMING to Him" and "BELIEVING on Him," with that FAITH, which is "the gift of God."

2. The next remark, which I have to offer, on that view of the Lord's Supper which has been exhibited, is this:

It includes the Doctrine that the pardon, or remission of Post-Baptismal Sins is not only commemorated and sealed, but also CONVEYED by this ordinance.

Of the connection of Baptism with the remission of sins I have already spoken. The relation of the

Lord's Supper to that benefit equally demands our discriminating regards.

In the instituting words of Christ, we have the following language : "This is my blood of the New Testament," literally,—of the Covenant—"which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins." On the theory, then, that, by Christ's act of Institution, the elemental bread and wine were, at first, miraculously changed into His *literal* Body and Blood ; and that, by His minister's act of consecration, those elements are miraculously changed into *vehicles* of that same Body and Blood, it might seem to follow that this Blood, being still shed, still poured forth, does actually "convey," in the mystery of this Sacrament, "the remission of sins." Hence we have the following language from the leading modern advocate of this theory. Having spoken of the benefits of the Lord's Supper to Christians, its "gift for the holy ;" and proceeding to speak of its benefits to "sinners," its "special joy" to the guilty ; he says : "Although most which is spoken belongs to Christians, as belonging already to the household of saints, and the family of heaven, and the communion of angels, and unity with God ; still, here, as elsewhere in the New Testament, there is a subordinate and subdued notion of sin ;" so that "what wraps the *Saint* already in the third heaven, may yet uphold us *sinners*, that the pit

shut not her mouth upon us. The same reality of the Divine gift makes it angels' food to the Saint, the *Ransom* to the *sinner*; and both, because it is the Body and Blood of Christ. Were it only a thankful commemoration of His redeeming love, or only a showing forth of His Death, or a strengthening only and refreshing of the soul; it were, indeed, a reasonable service; but it would have no direct healing for the sinner. To him, its special joy is that it is His Redeemer's very broken Body; it is His Blood, which was *shed for the remission of sins*. In the words of the Ancient Church, he 'drinks his Ransom;' he eateth that 'the very Body and Blood of the Lord,' the only sacrifice for sin: God 'poureth out' for him yet 'the most precious Blood of His only Begotten.' . . . "This may have been another truth, which our Lord intended to convey to us when He pronounced the words, as the form which consecrates the Sacramental Elements into His Body and Blood, that that precious Blood is still, in *continuance* and *application* of His one oblation once made upon the Cross, *poured out for us now*, CONVEYING to our souls, as being His Blood, with the other benefits of His passion, the REMISSION OF OUR SINS ALSO. . . 'That which is in the cup,' St. Chrysostom paraphrases, 'is that which flowed from His side; and of that do we partake.' How should we approach His Sacred side and remain

leprous still? Touching with our very lips that cleansing Blood, how may we not, with the Ancient Church, confess; 'Lo, this hath touched my lips and shall take away mine iniquities and cleanse my sins?' '*

The intended teaching of such language can be nothing less than this; that the Lord's Supper brings "a direct healing for the sinner;" that those who fall, as all do, into actual sin after baptism, may, though not Christians in the sense of being "Saints," yet go to the Sacrament, "touch their lips to the blood, which flowed from the side" of their Redeemer, "and remain leprous no longer;" but receive there remission of their sins, and have their iniquities taken away: and this, because Christ, by His form of words, repeated by the lips of His minister, "consecrates the Sacramental elements into His Body and Blood." By this perpetuated miracle, "His blood is, in continuance and application of His one oblation, still poured forth for us; and still, by this continuance, "conveys the remission of our sins."

Need I say that this is utterly different from the real doctrine of the Bible? The Word of God, interpreted by the laws of the language, in which His own inspired servants spake, does not say that

• Sermon before the University of Oxford, N. Y., p. 9, 10.

the words of Christ consecrate the elemental Bread and Wine into His Body and Blood. All that His words imply is, that the Bread and Wine "are" His Body and Blood, in the well-known Scriptural sense of REPRESENTING that Body and Blood. By the force of its own self-interpreting law, the Bible sweeps clean away the very foundation of the monstrous superstructure of doctrine, which has been built on these truly reasonable words of Christ. Christ says that HIS BLOOD was "shed for the Remission of sins;" but He does not teach that HIS SUPPER was instituted for the remission of sins. He teaches no more than this, that His Supper was instituted "IN REMEMBRANCE" of Him, whose "blood cleanseth from all sin." His blood was "shed for the remission of sins," not at the institution of the Sacrament, but on the Cross of Calvary; and the pouring out of the Wine at the Lord's Supper is, and to the end of time will remain, but a silently speaking MEMORIAL of that glorious Sacrifice, in which prophecy was fulfilled, and on which hangs the hope of a world's salvation. With this the instituting words of Christ, interpreted by the idiom of His own language, perfectly accord. "Drink ye all of this cup; for this REPRESENTS my blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this, as oft as ye drink it, IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME." To convert this simple,

sublime MEMORIAL into a mysteriously actual "continuance" of Christ's blood-shedding ; to consider the Church as, by a standing miracle, the perpetuated Incarnation of Christ ; and to regard this instituted Sacrament as that miraculously continued Sacrifice, in which His blood still flows for the remission of sin—which is now the undisguised form of the theory—is plainly to fabricate a mere human notion, for which, as the Bible furnishes it no support, the Bible is, in no way, accountable. Everywhere, through the Bible, the pardon of sin is seen to depend on the shedding of the blood of atonement ; everywhere, through the Bible, outward rites are seen pointing us to this central truth of our religion ; but nowhere in the Bible are we taught that the effective pardon of sin, is CONVEYED by these outward rites. Speaking of these Rites under the old Dispensation, the Apostle says : " Every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins." Heb. 10 : 11. And then, speaking of Christ, as the only real, atoning High Priest, and of His one true Sacrifice as that, which does take away sins ; that Sacrifice, which was once beheld by faith looking forward through the types of the old Dispensation, and is now seen with still clearer vision, by looking backward through the Symbols of the New ;—he says : that

“after He had offered one Sacrifice for sins forever, He sat down on the right hand of God,” no more to appear among men in the work of Sacrifice ; “for, by one offering, He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Heb. 10 : 12, 14. In Him, “we have Redemption through His blood—the forgiveness of sins.” “We are sanctified,”—our sins are washed away—“by the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ ONCE.” What follows?—“Where remission of these is, THERE IS NO MORE OFFERING FOR SIN.” Heb. 10 : 10, 18. Christ, by His ONE blood-shedding, having ONCE opened the way of forgiveness, all sacrifice for sin thenceforward CEASED. The true offering for sin was full and complete, when, on the Cross, Jesus exclaimed, “IT IS FINISHED,” bowed His head and died ! Being finished then, it needs no continuance now, other than that outward revelation of the Word, and that inward revelation of the Spirit, which make it effectually known to FAITH. The Sacrament of Christ is not designed to be a daily, or a stated, repetition, or continuance, of Christ’s once and forever perfected Sacrifice, a repeated, or continual, opening of the fountain of His blood, in order to render the remission of sin still possible, or accessible. It is, like the types of the old Dispensation, though with a clearer and more quickening meaning to faith, but a silent, significant, symbolic Teacher, telling

us guilty sinners where to look, where to go, as the only source, to which we can look or go, for that forgiveness, without which our everlasting perishing is sealed.

But, besides the intrinsic error, and growing out of the inherent falsehood, of the teaching, which directs men to this Sacrament for the pardon of post-baptismal sin, a pardon authoritatively dispensed by priestly intervention, there is one great and fearfully realized danger ; viz : that multitudes of darkened souls will stop at the sacrament itself, rest in the mere sign of forgiveness, and never see through, or beyond it that grand, life-giving, soul-saving act of Christ, in which alone is wrapped up their hope of everlasting salvation, and, missing the sight of which by faith, they miss forever the enjoyment of what it offers. The teaching here indicated is too full of peril to be found in the Gospel of our Salvation. It is calculated to hush myriads of otherwise uneasy consciences into a quiet indulgence in a life of actual impenitence, under the soothing thought that they may, if not purchase a pardon with money in a mass, at least "drink" it with "their Ransom" from a chalice. To such blind self-deception, woeful experience tells us, is the natural mind everywhere prone. It is not necessary to speculate on the question how far some minds may hold error on this point in connection

with truth ; or how far they may see through the error and reach the truth ; or how far they may thus, in spite of their error, be saved through the truth. It is enough for us to know that such power to penetrate the mists of moral darkness is not natural to the eyesight of the human mind ; and that it is not the ordinary way of the Spirit to use error as a medium through which to make the truth apparent. It is enough for us to know that the human mind is always, by nature, fearfully inclined to rest in outward observances, and to make a religion of forms a salve to the conscience when rendered sore by the neglect of a religion of power.

When viewed as a divinely instituted SIGN, this Sacrament readily points us, by a language peculiarly its own, to the vastly and vitally important thing signified ; but, when considered as a CONVEYING ordinance, CONFERRING the pardon, which it symbolizes and seals, it proves but a VEIL to make still darker the already darkened heart of the natural man. Christ evidently designed His ordinances to be a luminous system of INDICES, pointing men solely to Himself. Error makes them a set of BLINDS, often screening Him effectually from view.

The sum of our teaching on this point is, in short, the burden of the Gospel ; that Jesus Christ came to be "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin

of the world ;” John 1 : 29 : that He came to be this Lamb of Sacrifice by shedding His blood on the Cross ; that, “whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins ;” Acts 10 : 43 : that He “is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth ;” Rom. 10 : : 4 that, “by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses ;” Acts 13 : 39 : in a word, “that God so loved the world that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life :” John 3 : 16 ; should receive a free forgiveness of sin, and, continuing in the faith, a full and perfect salvation. All this, and much more to the same purpose, is said in the Gospel of the remission of sin, in those unqualified, unrestricted, universal terms, which carry the assurance of pardon and life to every believer in Jesus, wherever the knowledge of His atoning sacrifice may come ; an assurance of this pardon and life to FAITH alone, as the secret link of union with the Saviour, and as the root of all true holiness in man ; a faith which may be aided by signs, as the eye is aided by the telescope in looking up at the nightly orbs in the heavens ; but which is never to rest in the signs, as if they alone were the marvelous things to be studied. This teaching is the one glorious brightness of the

Gospel ; and we can no more put it out of sight, than we can put out the sun in the firmament. It opens God's way for the remission of sins ; a way in which whosoever walketh shall never perish.

It is, indeed, urged by the advocates of the theory in question, that although the atoning sacrifice of Christ be the only MERITORIOUS cause of the remission of sins, yet the Sacraments of the Church are the really INSTRUMENTAL cause of this remission ; or that the pardon, which Christ PURCHASED on the Cross, He CONVEYS by the Sacraments.

In reply to this, however, it is enough simply to raise the question : What, then, becomes of those millions, who have the Word of God, who hear the Gospel preached, and who believe in Christ "with all the heart ;" but who have yet no access to the Sacraments, in the only sense, in which this Theory understands the Sacraments ? To this question the Theorists have no other reply than that, if such are saved, they are saved, not by promise, not by guarantee, not by covenant, but in some way, of which God hath been pleased to tell us nothing ; perhaps by those superaboundings of grace, of which the Church, as a "vessel of mercy," is so unconfinably full, that they overflow and reach even to those hapless believers, who are providentially left, if not left too far, beyond the limits of COVENANTED favor.

This, however, their only resort, brings out the thoroughly unscriptural character of the Theory, to which it belongs. According to the Bible, ALL, to whom the Gospel comes, and who truly believe in Christ, are saved, not by the vague possibilities of "uncovenanted mercy," but under the guarantee of express PROMISE, of Covenant and oath. The Covenant of grace goes with the Word of God. It reaches wherever that Word is received into the faith of renewed and sanctified hearts. It is not circumscribed by the walls of a visible Church, as those walls are built by the architects of this restrictive Theory. It covers, with its Divine Palladium, every believer in Jesus, who, having that Word, in which the Covenant is revealed, clasps it to his heart and lives on its assurance. Every such soul has, for "a strong consolation," those "two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie." Every such soul is among those "heirs of promise," to whom "God hath more abundantly shown the immutability of His COUNSEL," in that He hath "confirmed it by an OATH." Every such soul "hath fled for refuge to lay hold on THE HOPE set before him;" and this "Hope he hath as an anchor of the soul, both SURE and STEADFAST, and which entereth into that within the Veil; whither the Forerunner is for us entered, even JESUS, made a High Priest forever, after the order of Melchise-

dec." Heb. 6 : 17-20. Every such soul is saved, not by chance, not by possibility, not by peradventure, but by PROMISE, and under the OATH OF THE COVENANT ; whether he fall within or without those walls of the visible Church, which are localized and reared by the hands of this limitarian Theory. God hath not two ways of extending remission of sins to the disciples of Jesus. He hath but ONE way, wherever the knowledge of the Saviour comes ; and this way is thus marked out : " God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that WHOSOEVER believeth on Him, should not perish but have everlasting life." There is such a thing as "fighting against God." It is found in many acts ; but in none, I think, more plainly than in that, which takes this broad Covenant of Grace and seeks to narrow it down, in accommodation to the terms of a Theory of the visible Church, which shuts out from the comfort of a sure and certified Hope any real believer in the Love-given Son of God.

If the question should here be asked : ' What connection, then, have the Sacraments with the remission of sins ? Why does our Church, in her offices for Baptism and the Lord's Supper, say so much of that remission in connection with these Sacraments ? ' I reply ; the answer to this question has already been given in what I have said about

Baptism. The Sacraments have just this connection with the remission of sins : They are divinely ordained SYMBOLS of remission : they are God's SEALS of His promise to forgive on the terms of the Covenant. As our standard Homilies express it, they are "visible *signs*, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the PROMISE of free forgiveness of our sins." (Hom. on Com. Pr. and Sac.) It is not the SIGN, but the PROMISE, the COVENANT, that conveys the forgiveness. The distinction is finely drawn in the language of our Church, when she invites her members to the Lord's Table. She speaks of "The most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, to be by them received in remembrance of His meritorious Cross and Passion ; whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven." In her judgment, it is not through this "most comfortable Sacrament" that "we obtain remission of our sins," not even through this Sacrament, as an instrument of CONVEYANCE, but through Christ's "meritorious Cross and Passion ALONE ;" and this "most comfortable Sacrament" is by us received in REMEMBRANCE, only, of that all-prevailing Sacrifice.

The Covenant of grace, then, as bound up in God's Word, may go without its signs and seals, especially as placed in the hands of any particular

visible Church. These signs and seals, even as we are accustomed to see them, are not trifles ; but rich and comforting treasures. It is better, we think, to see them under our forms than to see them in more naked simplicity. And yet, it would be better that our right arm were palsied, than that we should attempt to stay the flight of the Angel of the Covenant, as He goeth forth to carry " the everlasting Gospel," and with it pardon and peace to every poor sinner that will believe, because that Messenger of good news carrieth not with Him everywhere those rich and precious forms of the evangelic signs and seals, with which, for our special comfort, He has been pleased to endow the Church of our affections. It may even be said that it is better to be without any visible sign and seal, than to be without that eternal Covenant of grace, which God hath bound up in His Word, and which carries Salvation through Christ to every believing heart.

3. The next remark which I have to make on the Theory before us is this :

The real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in this Sacrament, as this Theory understands that Presence, is an IMPOSSIBILITY.

It is true that we are told by the Theorists that the Presence is spiritual, and invisible. Still, they insist that it is real ; that it is not an ideal presence ;

that it is not a presence to Faith only, seeing Christ's crucified Body on the Cross ; nor a presence to Faith alone, seeing Christ's glorified Body in Heaven ; but that it is the Presence of His REAL Body ; sometimes described as " the very Body and Blood which were broken and shed on the Cross ;" and at others, named without such limitation ; but, whether thus defined or not, still, His REAL Body and Blood present with the elements in the Sacrament ; and thus present whether faith discern them or not, or though the communicant have no faith for the discernment. This, I repeat, is an impossibility. For, besides the truth taught by the Apostle, that " Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," and that therefore Christ's risen and glorified Body has neither flesh nor blood, in the natural sense of those terms ; besides this, it is a universal attribute of Body, even in its Spiritualized state, that it exists in PLACE, is limited by place, and cannot be present in more than ONE place, at one and the same TIME. Refine, spiritualize and glorify Body as we will, and render it invisible as we may, even by the absence from it of flesh and blood, still, it is but BODY, with its lines and limits, and can no more exist in two places, at one and the same time, than it can when robed in its grossest visibility. Hence the English Prayer Book, explaining the posture of " kneeling" at the time of the Com-

munion, says, among other things: "It is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental bread and wine remain still, in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ"—spiritualized and glorified, indeed,—“are in heaven and NOT HERE, it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be, at one time, in more places than one.” That is; it is impossible for the natural Body of Christ, however spiritualized and glorified, to be in heaven and yet on earth; or that it should be present on earth, at one and the same time, in all places where this Sacrament is simultaneously administered. Of course, such a presence is still more impossible, if impossibilities may be compared, when predicated of “the very Body and Blood of Christ, which were broken and shed on the Cross;” which, as composed of the corruptibilities of flesh and blood, were dropped when His glorified Body sprang up from the Rock of Joseph; and which, consequently, are no longer in existence anywhere, as a separate, organic human frame. To suppose such a presence of His Body,

whether under the one, or under the other, of these forms, is to suppose that finite body, like infinite Spirit, may be OMNIPRESENT. It is to teach an absurdity, an impossibility, as thorough as that the Bread and Wine are, by the miracle of a priestly consecration, themselves transubstantiated, wherever this Sacrament is administered, so that they are no longer bread and wine, but the true, visible Body and Blood of Christ; yea, as many such Bodies as there are simultaneous administrations of this Sacrament, or even as there are separate communicants, who, at one and the same time, are held to receive, each and every one, whole and entire, the undivided Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Take this subject as it lies in the Bible, and all is simple and plain, however deep and sublime be the significance, with which it is invested. The crucified and broken Body of Christ exists, for us, in its organic form, only on the Cross, where, once for all, its great office was "finished." His risen and glorified Body exists only and always in Heaven, where He "is forever set down at the right hand of God." At His sacred Supper, then, wherever simultaneously administered over the face of the wide Earth, Faith takes the soul of every believer either to His Cross on Calvary, or to His throne in Heaven, and shows him there, according to the

bent, which his spirit may have received, either the pierced and bleeding form of Him, who once died for his sins, or the beatified and triumphant form of Him, who now reigns, his Advocate with the Father on high. No matter from what wide extremes of the earth His communing disciples thus look upon Him, there He is, the one gathering point of all their worshiping thoughts ; the one object of Faith's adoring vision to all His countless followers below ; made, through faith, "spiritual food," the "heavenly refection of their souls." Repeating "the advice of the Council of Nice," our "Homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming" of this Sacrament [N. Y., Ed. 1815, pp. 279-80] says : "We ought to *lift up* our minds by *faith* ; and, leaving these inferior and earthly things,"—these material emblems of the Divine reality—"there seek it where the Sun of Righteousness ever shineth. Take, then, this lesson, . . . that, when thou goest up to the reverend Communion, to be satisfied with *spiritual* meats, thou *look up*, with *faith*, upon the holy Body and Blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it with *the mind*, thou receive it with the hand of *thy heart*, and thou take it fully with *thy inward man*." Here, all is by FAITH ; here is no touching with a FLESHLY LIP, no receiving from a FLESHLY HAND, the "very Body and Blood which were broken and

shed upon the Cross." FAITH touches, FATH feeds on, the heavenly food.

But, the moment we adopt a Theory, which brings that Body down either from the Cross to the Communion Table, or from Heaven to earth, and which makes it really present in the Sacrament as simultaneously administered in numberless places, or in any two places, that moment our theory involves an impossibility ; while, at the same time, it plunges the company of Christ's followers into a sea of confusion, where the waves of conjecture and imagination, of error and superstition, toss and mix themselves incessantly, leaving the inquiring mind no resting-place, save that which it finds by driving through uncertainty into utter dissatisfaction ; from utter dissatisfaction into perplexing doubt ; and from perplexing doubt into blank unbelief.

I said, the INQUIRING mind can find no other resting-place under this theory. I add ; some minds will be ALWAYS inquiring ; and, at times, the MASS of minds will be roused to inquiry. The mind of man cannot, always and everywhere, be broken into bondage, into an unquestioning submission to mere human authority, as it binds its burdens of absurdity upon the backs of abject ignorance, even though it be beneath the awfully heavy rod of religious terrors that it is first made to stoop. Prone to the earth as all minds are through sin, and

willing as many are to be fettered for life in ignorance, yet there are always some that will not be slaves in understanding, though they may be slaves to passion ; and others, who will not be slaves either in the one sense, or in the other ; while there is ever a liability to those crises, when the mass of mind will be roused from ignoble lethargy, and when those master-spirits that always rise from such a “ vasty deep ” of agitation, will seize on the excited elements and work them up into a tempest, strong enough to scatter the gloomy fabric of superstition into one wide wreck. Such crises have occurred ; they may again occur ; and whenever they do occur, they present those emergencies, in which myriads of valuable minds are driven from their moorings in the haven of the Church ; and thus, what was intended to hold them bound to an unquestioning credulity, results in forcing them off into cold unbelief, and even into utter atheism.

The difficulty in the Theory under examination, which arises from the necessity of supposing Christ's Body to be brought from Heaven to earth, and in fact to exist simultaneously in more than one place, has not been unperceived by the advocates of that Theory. Some, though they seem disinclined to meet the difficulty in its whole breadth, yet tell us thus much : “ This manner of presence is unaccountable and past finding out ; not to be searched

and pried into by reason, but believed by faith. And if it seem IMPOSSIBLE that the flesh of Christ should descend, and come to be our food, through so great a distance, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions, and how absurd it would be to undertake to measure His immensity by our weakness and narrow capacity ; and so, make our faith to conceive and believe what our reason cannot comprehend.*

But, to what does all this amount, but the presenting of an unaccountably absurd notion, demanding for it an unquestioning faith, and forbidding reason to inquire into its possibility ? If this principle be allowed, what unaccountable absurdity, nay, what palpable impossibility, may not be brought forward and urged on the unreasoning credulity of blinded men ?—What more could be said to make us believe in marble statues, weeping blood ; in pictures on canvas, rolling their eyes ; or in literal flesh and Blood, transubstantiated from bread and wine ?

But as I have remarked, the extract does not meet the whole breadth of the difficulty. This difficulty arises, not merely from the necessity of bringing the Body of Christ once, or twice, or any

* Tracts, vol. i., N. Y., p. 199.

number of times, from Heaven to earth ; but specially, from the necessity of so bringing it down to earth as that, at the same time, it shall remain in Heaven where it is "set down forever at the right hand of God ;" nor only so, but moreover from the necessity of so bringing it down to earth, as that, while it yet remains in Heaven, it shall also be present, whole and entire, at one and the same moment, in many and distant places of the earth ; and be received, simultaneously, whole and entire, by each and every one of the numberless and scattered communicants of the Church. Nevertheless, although the extract does not meet the whole breadth of the difficulty, yet it looks towards that difficulty ; and, in doing so, adopts a principle, which, if allowed, will be found to embody a power sufficient to force any absurdity, any impossibility, on the unreasoning credulity of blind ignorance and unquestioning superstition. Such teaching cometh not of the Bible ! This is not a question whether faith shall receive what reason cannot comprehend. Such demands on the faculty addressed by Revelation are undoubtedly made. Thus, reason cannot comprehend how the Divine and the human natures are so united as to form one Christ. Yet faith may be called on to receive the doctrine, because it is revealed, and because it involves neither absurdity, nor impossibility, but is merely incomprehensible.

Neither, again, is this a question touching the possible modes of God's existence as an Infinite Spirit. For, although reason cannot comprehend how God, as such a Spirit, can be omnipresent, yet faith may be required to believe it, because the doctrine is revealed, and because it involves nothing either absurd or impossible. But the question now before us is one, which touches the presence, or omnipresence of that BODY of Christ, in which God hath been pleased to become "manifest in the flesh;" of that "very substance which He took of the Blessed Virgin, and afterwards carried with Him into Heaven." [Tracts, vol. i. N. Y. p. 202.] This is the question, with which we are here concerned; and being such, we say to it, that of the modes of BODILY existence we do know something, and, in the simple light of reason, as God's gift, can conceive more: and therefore, we are not to be awed from inquiries into it by the suggestion that this would be to question the omnipotence of the Divine Spirit. It is, indeed, said that, "with God all things are possible;" but this is spoken with well-known, necessary limitations. Some things are impossible even with Him. Change, incongruity, sin, falsehood, absurdity are impossible with Him. This notion of the UBIQUITY of Christ's Body is both false and absurd. It is, therefore, impossible, and cannot be forced on us as the

meaning of that Divine Teacher, in whom dwelt ever the spirit of clear, transparent wisdom, and of reasonable, though oftentimes unfathomable, truth. We must believe Christ, when He says : "This is my Body ; this is my Blood : " we must believe ALL that He means by the saying : but, at the same time, we may believe ONLY what He means, as interpreted by the laws of His own language ; for to believe more, or other than this, is to believe—not Him, but—our own groundless, or absurd conceits.

I am not ignorant of another explanation, or rather attempt at explanation, of this difficulty, as given in the famous Tract, No. 90. But, really, that attempt seems to me a quibble, unworthy of a serious author. The writer was led to it by the force of the language, which I have already quoted from the English Prayer Book. This language, as we have seen, denies the "corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" in the Sacrament. This, the writer intimates, was intended to deny, not the REAL, but only the CARNAL presence of Christ's Body. That is, the presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, though not "corporeal," in the sense of "carnal," is yet "real" in the sense of "bodily." This, however, is not all. The English Prayer Book says : "The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here ; it

being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be, at one time, in more places than one." But this, the writer again intimates, is intended to deny, not the "real," but only the "local" presence of that Body and Blood in the Sacrament. And then, he gives a dissertation of several pages to show that, in the Eucharist, Christ "is REALLY here, yet not LOCALLY;" and to illustrate what is meant by being "really" yet not "locally" present. The result, which he reaches, is, that "locally," Christ's Body and Blood are at God's right hand; yet, really, they are present here. But, how does he reach this result? I cannot follow the whole of his process; but its principal steps may be seen in the following extracts.

"Why should the perception of our eyes, or our ears, be the standard of presence, or distance? Christ may really be close to us, though in Heaven; and His presence in the Sacrament may be but a manifestation to the worshiper of that nearness; not a change of PLACE, which may be unnecessary." . . . "The Body and Blood of Christ may be REALLY, LITERALLY present in the holy Eucharist; yet, not having become present by LOCAL passage, may still, literally and really, be at God's right hand." . . . "A thing is present, which is so circumstanced as to ACT upon us, and INFLUENCE us, whether we are sensible of it or not." . . . "The

stars are millions of miles off ; yet they impress ideas upon our souls through our sight." . . . "Sight, for certain purposes, annihilates space." . . . "Other unknown capacities, bodily or spiritual, may annihilate it for other purposes." . . . Christ may "open the Heavens, . . . in the Sacramental Rite," . . . and "then dispense with time and space, in the sense, in which they are daily dispensed with in the sun's warming us at the distance of 100,000,000 of miles." . . . "Locomotion is the means of a MATERIAL presence ; the Sacrament is the means of His SPIRITUAL presence." . . . "We kneel before His heavenly throne, and the distance is as nothing : it is as if that throne were the altar close to us." [Tr. No. 90. Lon. 1841. p. 52-57.]

At this, as a proposed explanation, I confess astonishment. Does all the talk of these writers upon this point come, then, to no more than this ; that the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament because, though locally in Heaven, yet they are "so circumstanced" in that Rite as "to ACT upon us and INFLUENCE us" on earth ?—that, as the stars and the sun affect our senses and "impress ideas upon our souls" through the distance of incalculable millions of miles, and may therefore be said to be present to us, so the Body of Christ "acts" upon us and impresses ideas on our souls even from its seat at God's right hand ;

and may therefore be said to be present to us in the Sacrament?—This sounds very much like the Scriptural and reasonable truth that, at the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ are present to FAITH, as that spiritual faculty, which annihilates time and space ; which sees them, though locally absent, and thus makes them effectively present ; which gives them influence over our souls, and makes them "our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament." This is the very doctrine which we hold, and against which, considered as exhausting the sense of Christ's presence, these writers, in other places, so strenuously contend ! Can such an explanation have been seriously given ? Notwithstanding all that has been said, in so many ways, to prove that "the very Body and Blood of Christ, as broken and shed upon the Cross," are present in the Eucharist, and that they are "conveyed by the hands" of the officiator and "received into the body and soul" of the worshiper, at the same time and together with their ordained symbols ; does it after all mean no more than this : "We kneel before His heavenly throne, and the distance is as nothing : it is as if that throne were the altar close to us?"—No : this is not all that is meant : and there are, in the explanation, other phrases which point to the real signification, that underlies all these plausible words. For instance, the writer

says: "We know nothing to negative the notion, that the soul may be capable of having Christ present to it by the stimulating of DORMANT, or the development of POSSIBLE energies." That is, over and above a presence to FAITH, giving the soul her "spiritual food and sustenance," there is, or may be, a Presence to "other UNKNOWN capacities, BODILY or spiritual;" a Presence, stimulating DORMANT, or developing POSSIBLE energies within us; in short, Christ present by MIRACLE as well as present to FAITH.

The truth is, no one can read the writings of these authors, and then read the explanation, to which we have been attending, without feeling that what is ostensible in that explanation is but a cover, convenient for the occasion, thrown over the real meaning, which is held, of a true Bodily Presence in the Eucharist over and above what we understand by a Presence to faith. This may be well intended, but it is wrong. In sober discussion, no man may use at one moment plain English terms, and, at another moment, virtually say that they mean no such thing as the plain English implies. They must be held to the literal meaning of their ordinary language, and not be allowed to escape through an explanation, to which they may be driven by an emergency.

4. The last, and perhaps most important re-

mark, which I have to offer on the Theory under consideration, is this :

Its great error is a MORAL GENERANT : that is ; it produces OTHER ERRORS.

If ~~the~~ the error touching the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, independently of faith in the recipient, stood alone, a barren notion, incapable of moral production,—though even then it would be of sufficient magnitude to call for the strongest protest against its admission,—yet, as a practical evil, operating through ages, and upon the ecclesiastical body corporate, it would be comparatively harmless. But this error stands not alone ; it is not a barren notion ; it is PROLIFIC ; and its offspring are, if possible, more mischievous than their parent. This remark opens a wide field. I shall not attempt to explore its whole breadth ; but, in as few words as possible, will endeavor to indicate something of its extent and of its contents.

1. One of the first offspring, then, which the error produces, is—the doctrine, that, in the Lord's Supper, there is offered a “TRUE HOST :” in plainer English, a “REAL SACRIFICE.”

This conception had its birth centuries ago, and in another part of the Church ; but it is fast growing, or rather, has already reached its full growth, in the language of many of our own religious teachers,

We are told that, in the Lord's Supper, the sinner "drinks his RANSOM ; he eateth the very Body and Blood of the Lord, the only SACRIFICE for sin." . . . "That precious Blood is still, in continuance and application of His One Oblation, once made upon the Cross, poured out for us now, conveying to our souls, as being His Blood, with the other benefits of His passion, the remission of our sins also." These teachers call the sacrifice, which is offered in the Eucharist, a "commemorative, impetratory sacrifice ;" and hold that "by this sacrifice is obtained remission of sins for the whole Church, and some additional refreshment for the souls of THE DEAD in their intermediate state." [Tract, 81, pp. 4-7.]

If it be true that Christ's Body and Blood are really, however invisibly, present in the Eucharist, His Body as broken, and His Blood as shed, upon the Cross, and thus present independently of the faith of the recipient ; and if both are thus made an Offering unto God ; it of course follows that, in every repetition of the Sacrament, there is a repetition, or continuance, of the Sacrifice of Christ ; in a sense subordinate, it is true, to that, in which it was first offered on the Cross ; yet still, as they express it, a "TRUE HOST," a real sacrifice ; available for pardon to the living members of the Church, and not without benefit to the Dead.

Hence, in their phraseology, what St. Paul calls "the Lord's Table," becomes "an ALTAR;" the consecrated elements cover a VICTIM; and the minister of Jesus stands a PRIEST amid the awful solemnities of a veritable SACRIFICE. And hence, under the Christian, as well as under the Jewish Dispensation, "every priest standeth, daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices;" of which we may say, as the Apostle said of those typic offerings of old, that they "can never take away sins." If this Theory be right, it ceases to be true, that Christ, by "offering ONE Sacrifice for sins," . . . "hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." The work of their salvation is carried towards completion by MANY sacrifices; sacrifices more numerous than the great annual types of atonement under the law.

Now, of all this I can say no less than that it is, practically and doctrinally, utter subversion to the Gospel. This Divine System knows nothing of any Sacrifice, but that which Christ "finished" on the Cross; and by finishing which He brought to an end forever the whole system of even Typical Sacrifices. The Gospel knows nothing of any system of "commemorative sacrifices," as successors to the types of the Law, and looking backwards, as their predecessors looked forwards, to the Cross; while, at the same time, they avail for pardon to the

living and for grace to the Dead. As a Rite, the Lord's Supper is, indeed, "commemorative," and looks backwards to the Cross; but, as a commemorative SACRIFICE, it is burdened with a human invention, added to what the Gospel calls, simply, "the breaking of bread," "The Lord's Supper," "The Lord's Table," "The COMMUNION of the Body and Blood of Christ," or a "social fellowship," in partaking of the Bread and Wine, as ordained Symbols of Christ's Body and Blood; in contradistinction from a merely private and irregular feast upon those elements, as though they were but an ordinary and profane meal.

If the Lord's Supper was designed to carry with it, in any sense, the character and efficacy of a sacrifice, why is there no intimation of such a design in all the New Testament? The truth is, that by ceasing to apply the term, "Sacrifice," in its proper sense, under the Gospel, to anything save the Death of Christ, as an atonement for sin, the inspired Writers evidently designed to embody this grave and vitally important teaching, that, the ONE, great and only Propitiatory Sacrifice having been offered once for all, the whole system of typical and representative sacrifices is at an end forever; and is forever to remain without successor and without substitute. For this teaching, too, there is a need now, which did not exist under the

old Dispensation. Then, the great atonement had been neither publicly offered, nor fully revealed. It was necessary, therefore, to keep up a lively idea of SIN and of the necessity of an atonement, by a system of most Speaking Types. To this end, LIVING victims were slain, and ANIMAL blood was sprinkled, amid all the solemnities of an imposing ritual; a ritual carrying, nevertheless, on its very face, the truth, enunciated by the Apostle, that "those sacrifices, which were offered year by year continually," could not of themselves "take away sin;" but could only point the eye of faith to a REAL "Lamb of God," and thus keep alive both a sense of sin, and a conviction of the need of a real, efficacious atonement. But now, this real and efficacious atonement having been both publicly offered and fully revealed, the whole system of typical and representative sacrifices is abolished, and the pall of significant silence is, under the Gospel, thrown over the dead body of that system in order that there may be nothing—not even a WORD—to turn away our eye from the great Sacrifice on the Cross, the true "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the World," as He stands forth luminously manifest in the Gospel, the only hope of the sinner. To introduce the idea that "commemorative, or impetratory Sacrifices" are necessary and available under the Gospel, is to

argue defect, incompleteness, in the One Sacrifice of Christ. It is to say, that that one Sacrifice, through the Word which reveals it, and through the Spirit which applies it, to our souls, when, amid the teachings of the Gospel, we behold by faith "the Lamb of God" lifted up, is not enough ; but that its efficacy depends upon, or must be conveyed through, the mystery of a visible and continued sacrificing. A visible Rite may, indeed, as I shall hereafter show, be of use in various ways ; but to invest it with the character thus claimed for it, is, I repeat, utter subversion to the Gospel.

The silence of the Gospel as to any sacrificial character in the Eucharist, is something most significantly remarkable. Like some other New Testament silences, it cannot be accounted for without ascribing it to design, or at least to a voice of teaching overpoweringly loud, in the presence of which such an error as that now in view could not live. The Gospel does not hesitate to give the name of "SACRIFICES" to various other things. Thus, it calls the "bodies" of Christians "sacrifices," even while they are "living." Rom. 12 : 1. It calls "faith" a "sacrifice" as well as a "service." Phil. 2 : 17. It calls the liberalities of Christians in the spread of the Gospel a "sacrifice, acceptable and well pleasing to God." Phil. 4 : 18 ; Heb. 13 : 16. It calls "praise," and "giving thanks"

a "Sacrifice," as being "the fruit of lips," that know how to interpret the gratitude of holy hearts. Heb. 13 : 15. And it calls the Worship and other good works of all Christians "Sacrifices," "spiritual" in their nature, and offered by "a holy Priesthood" in a "spiritual house." 1 Pet. 2 : 5. And the Gospel calls all these things "Sacrifices," because, though, in their proper nature, not sacrifices, yet the beautiful figures, in which they are called so, carry with them their own interpretation, and can never mislead the reader. But it never once calls the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice ; evidently because, though, in its proper nature, not a Sacrifice, yet, such is its significant relation to that, which is a Sacrifice, and of which it is a symbol, that, to call it, even figuratively, a Sacrifice, would be to mislead innumerable minds, ever prone to rest in outward signs, by the apparent authority of a divine sanction. Everything else, pleasing to God, may be called figurative Sacrifices ; but not this : lest, in its peculiar connection, Superstition should translate the figurative into the literal ; and thus, to use the words of our Homily, "lest of the MEMORY, it be made a SACRIFICE ;" that is, lest what was intended to be a MEMORIAL of Christ's Death and Passion, be perverted into a *Sacrifice*, in derogation of that of which it is a memorial.

And, then, as the Gospel is thus significantly

silent on this point, it is deserving of very special consideration that a similar silence pervades the STANDARDS OF OUR CHURCH when speaking of the Lord's Supper.—These Standards never apply the term Sacrifice, even in a figurative sense, to this Sacrament.

Our "office for the administration of the Lord's Supper" hesitates not to call the "Alms" of the communicants "Sacrifices," just as the Gospel feels no hesitation in calling them so. Their offerings also of "praise and thanksgiving" it calls a "Sacrifice," with a similar following of the Gospel. The presentation of themselves, "souls and bodies," it calls a "living Sacrifice," in the very words of the Gospel. And finally, it calls the "bounden duty and service" of their worship in this Sacrament a "Sacrifice," which, though "unworthy through their manifold sins to offer," yet they humbly present in their capacity, as described in the Gospel, of "a holy Priesthood," privileged "to offer up spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." All these things our Service unhesitatingly calls Sacrifices, because, though not Sacrifices in the proper sense of the term, yet the palpable figures, in which they are called so, carry their own interpretation, and can never mislead the worshiper. But it never once calls the Lord's Supper a Sacrifice. It calls the ordinance by various other

names, such as "holy mysteries," "pledges of His love;" "a continual Remembrance of His Death;" "the **MEMORIAL**, which Thy Son hath commanded us to make;" "the Banquet of a most heavenly food;" and, in so doing, it misleads no one: but, it never once calls the sacred Supper a Sacrifice, because, by doing so, it would mislead those who are inclined "of a memorial to **MAKE** a Sacrifice," and who would gladly shelter themselves in their act under the seeming authority of the Church. Our Service is too faithful, as a follower "both of the letter" and of "the Spirit" of that Word, of which she is both "a witness and a keeper," to fall into a use of language so dangerous.

The only place in our Communion Service, which looks like a leaning towards the error in question, is in that part of "The prayer of consecration," termed "**THE OBLATION**;" where, in speaking of the Bread and Wine, it calls them, "these Thy holy gifts, which we now **OFFER** unto Thee."—By some, this is thought to be **SACRIFICIAL** language; and "The oblation" is held to carry the sense of **SACRIFICE**. But this is a serious mistake. The difference, in the Bible, between "oblations" and the symbolically atoning Sacrifice for sin, is strongly marked. This Symbol of Atoning Sacrifice was divinely prescribed and enjoined, and was offered by the High Priest alone, as the living Type of Christ.

“Oblations” were encouraged as voluntary gifts, “freewill-offerings,” “peace-offerings,” and the like ; made by the people of their own motion, for the use of the priests, or as expressions of their gratitude and other religious affections to God. In reference to this sense of the word, undoubtedly, the “holy gifts,” which “we offer” at the Lord’s Supper, are called “The oblation.” Hence, this Sacrament itself is so often termed “THE EUCHARIST ;” that is, THE THANKSGIVING service. We offer back to God with great gladness the gifts, which He has bestowed upon us, not as, in any sense, a sacrifice for sin, but as an “oblation ;” a “Freewill-offering,” a “Thanksgiving Service,” a “Eucharist ;” just as we afterwards, “offer and present unto Him ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living Sacrifice.” The difference between a true Sacrifice for sin, and a mere “oblation,” is the same as that between the Death and Passion of Christ, and our freewill-offering of ourselves, or of our substance, to His holy service. An “oblation” is a sacrifice in the same sense only, in which Praise is a Sacrifice, or in which the voluntary dedication to God of the fruits of the earth is a Sacrifice.*

* For an account of the true notion of an “oblation,” the reader is referred to the following, which are a few only of the many passages in the Bible, which relate to the subject : Lev. ii, passim : iii : 1 ; vii : 14, 15 ;

And then, the same silence on this point, which characterizes our Communion Office, is distinctive of our *Catechism* also, and of our *Articles*; in neither of which is the Lord's Supper ever once called a Sacrifice.

How the *Homily* guards against the use of this term, and for what reason, we have already seen. To the language then quoted, however, I will here add the following: The "Homily on the Sacrament," (N. Y. ed. 1815, p. 379,) addressing the communicant, says: In the Lord's Supper, "thou needest no other man's help; no other sacrifice, or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention." And this is the more significant because it follows immediately after a reference to the necessity of "a sure and constant *faith*" in the great truth that Christ "hath made upon *His Cross* a full and *sufficient Sacrifice*" for every individual communicant; a faith which is characterized as a "Sticking fast to Christ's *promise*, made in His Institution, to make" Himself the believer's "*own*," and to "apply His *merits*" unto the believer's "*Self*." Observe here, this language, addressed to the communicant, holds up before him the one Sacrifice on the Cross, as

Num. xxxi: 50; Isa. xl: 20; lxvi: 3; Jere. xiv: 12; Ezek. xlv: 30; xlv: 1, 13; xlviii: 9, 20, 21; Dan. ix: 21, 27; ii, Chron. xxxi: 14; Ezek. xx: 40; xlv: 30.

“full and sufficient;” to be received through “faith” in that “promise,” by which Christ makes Himself the believer’s “own,” and applies to him His “merits;” and to be thus received to the exclusion of all “other Sacrifice” and of all other “Sacrificing priests.” The phraseology is discriminating. It does not say that, in the Lord’s Supper, “the hands of the minister convey” the “very Body and Blood of Christ,” to be received by the communicant “at the same time and together with their signs;” but it teaches that, in this Supper, Christ makes Himself the believer’s own,” his own Saviour; that He applies to the believer, not His flesh, but His “merits;” and that this is done in such a way as to shut out from the Sacrament all idea of any “other priest,” or “Sacrifice” than Christ Himself and His Sacrifice on the Cross.—On this point, Hooker caught the true spirit of the Homily, when he wrote: “SACRIFICE is now no part of the Church ministry; . . . the word, PRESBYTER, doth seem more fit, and, in propriety of speech, more agreeable than PRIEST, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Christ.”

In truth, Hooker speaks, in these last words, with somewhat less than his usual judiciousness. For, if “*Sacrifice* be now no part of the Church ministry,” then is *Priest* no name of the Christian minister. A Priest implies a Sacrifice; and there

can be no Priest in a ministry which has no Sacrifice to offer. This is a point which may well claim the most careful study from every Christian Scholar ; as the notion of a Sacrifice, with its correlative Priest and Altar, in the Lord's Supper, is one of vital interest to every Christian man. In connection with the Gospel it is not a harmless notion. It has wrought and is working incalculable mischief. It is the true secret of the deadly power of the Romish Church. Rome is powerful in her Pope and in her cardinals. She is powerful in her secret Inquisition, and in her Protean Monkeny. She is powerful in her corporate wealth and in her sensuous splendor. She is powerful in the celibacy of her clergy and in the spells of her superstition. She is powerful in the ghastly terrors of her Purgatory, and in the soothing tenderness of her Intercessors. She is powerful in pretended Miracle, and in practical Maryolatry. She is powerful in the claim, which she urges, to Infallibility in all her teachings and in all her decrees ; and in the chain of temporal and spiritual supremacy, which she has forged, and by which she binds the most distant peoples to her feet. She is powerful in all these and in numerous like things beside. And yet, all are but shadows from the one great, central substance of her power,—the notion of a SACRIFICE, a PRIEST and an ALTAR in the awful mystery of the

Mass ; a *Priest*, still intervening in the gift or the refusal of Pardon through a *Sacrifice* still to be offered, and an *Altar* still to be sprinkled : a Priest, still wielding the terrific alternative of Heaven or Hell, eternal Life or eternal Death, over abject souls, tormented with guilt and quaking at perdition. Take away from her at once, everywhere and forever, the power, which she wields in this her notion of Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar,—that power, in which she makes herself so fearfully felt at the Confessional, and at the death-bed ; through the thunderings of conscience, and the tremblings of superstition ; in the chambers of Princes, and in the hovels of peasants ; in the city and in the country ; in the vale and on the mountain ; in the desert and in the den ; take this dread secret utterly away ;—and all her other forms of power, however imposing now, would speedily vanish into air, or crumble into dust ;—in their stead would stand forth a simple Christian ministry, preaching pardon, through repentance and faith in Christ alone ; and beseeching men in His name to be reconciled to God ; and then throughout her wide realms, Christ and Christianity would once more rise into veritable prominence and effective life ; and, in all their unobscured benignity, would hasten to enlighten and elevate, purify and bless her innumerable millions.

But if this be so,—if the notion of Priest and Sacrifice has proved itself thus balefully powerful in the Church of Rome,—what shall we say? Just this. Give this notion the same deep and unyielding grasp upon our Theology, and the same prostrate and unquestioning mind among our people ;—let our people learn, by long ages of training, to shrink and tremble under the supposed power of the PRIEST to loose or bind the sinner by giving or withholding penance, absolution and the Sacrament ; by admitting to, or excluding from the awful SACRIFICE of the Altar ; give but these conditions,—and the notion will become as powerful and as baleful in its power, among us, as it has proved through so many dark centuries under the vast spiritual Despotism of Rome ; while every step that we take in the preparatory process, is but another step towards the ruinous result. Man is a sinner ; Sin is the prolific parent of Superstition ; and Superstition is ever fertile in multiplying deceptive substitutes for the one true Christ and His one work of saving truth through the Spirit. Every sinner would gladly be saved ; but he loves to be saved by his own merits, though his way lie through costly and even painful observances of outward form. Learning, Science, Genius itself can be made slaves to Sin, Superstition and the restlessness of unsanctified nature under the terrors of an

accusing conscience. A Priest, armed with the power of an enforced Confessional, a supposed Sacrifice, and a proffered pardon for sin, is stronger than the strongest of them all; and we may be yielding, even now, to a tendency, which shall yet draw our whole Church within the grasp of his deadly influence.

2. But, the mischievousness of the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper will more distinctly appear, when I add, that another offspring of this error of the Real Presence in the Eucharist is seen in the birth of TRANSUBSTANTIATION itself.

This is that monstrous conception, in which is embodied not only the Idea of a Real Presence and a continued Sacrifice of the very flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, but also the notion that the very substance of the Bread and Wine is so changed that they are Bread and Wine no longer, but the visible and sensible flesh and blood themselves of the crucified Saviour; seen and eaten under the mere "species," or appearance, of Bread and Wine.

The moral features of this monster-birth I will not attempt to paint. It is enough to say and to show that it sprang directly from that prolific Parent, the doctrine of the Real Presence and of a continuous Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. To say this requires but a sentence. To show it requires but little more.

To whichever age the ORIGIN of the Dogma of Transubstantiation be referred, whether to that of Parrhasius Radbertus in the Ninth century, or to that of Innocent III. and the Fourth Lateran Council in the Thirteenth, it is certain that it must find its parentage in the doctrine of the Real Presence and continuous Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament, understood in a very literal sense of the terms. Other origin than this the prodigious birth of Transubstantiation had not. Had not the notion of a Real Presence, carrying with it the literal substantiality of flesh and blood, been in full possession of the minds, which, in those ages, controlled the Theology of the Church, Transubstantiation never would, and, speaking in the light of Scripture and of reason, never could, have been conceived in human thought. And it is equally true, that, having obtained full possession of those controlling minds and, through them, of the great mass of those, who necessarily read little, and ordinarily think less, this notion of a literal Real Presence, speaking by the light of our natural Logic, could not but work itself out, in due time, into an alleged metamorphosis of the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper into the very substance of the Flesh and Blood of Christ. The Idea of a literal Real Presence is one of those conceptions which cannot lie still in the human mind ; one of

those marvelously strange things, which, when thrown among the multitude of men's thoughts, act with the power of a moral earthquake, putting everything into the agitation of a heaving, working motion. It is a prodigy which must shape other thoughts to itself. The ferment, into which it put the mind of the Mediæval Church, was made up, in part, of a healthy struggle to throw off something repugnant both to reason and to sense, and, in part, of a diseased eagerness to hold fast to something gratifying to the sensuous Philosophy of the natural heart, delighting in the strange imagery that fills the inner chambers of superstition. In other words, it was a ferment, made up of an effort to reject what both sense and reason condemned, and of an eagerness to retain what met the askings of the natural heart, trained to superstition, and delighting in a religion, which powerfully addressed the senses and kept stirring alive the emotions of thrilling wonder, and the workings of excited imagination. In that ferment, these latter elements obtained the mastery. Reason and sense yielded, and in their yielding, the doctrine of a literally Real Presence in the Sacrament became prolific. Transubstantiation received both birth and baptism ; and, in due time, it was brought up to final Confirmation. The steps in this process, so far as they can now be traced, were as follows :—

In the ninth Century, the ferment, produced by the doctrine of a literally Real Presence, led Radbert to attempt to satisfy the uneasiness, which was felt, and to settle the controversy, which it kept alive, by explaining the NATURE and MANNER of that Presence. Accordingly, he was the first to put the doctrine into this new form: that, "after the consecration of the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these Symbols but the OUTWARD FIGURE, under which the Body and Blood of Christ were really and locally present; and that the Body of Christ, thus present, was the same Body that was born of the Virgin, suffered on the Cross, and was raised from the dead."—His words are these:—"Licet figura panis et vini hic sit, omnino nihil aliud quam caro et sanguis, post consecrationem, credenda sunt; nec alia quam quæ nata est de Mariâ, passa in Cruce, resurrexit de sepulchro; et hæc, inquam, ipsa est, et ideo Christi caro est, quæ, pro vita mundi adhuc hodie offertur." [Book "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini."] This was the BIRTH of Transubstantiation. Previously, its embryo only had been in being. At its first appearance many were amazed at the new shape; still, the energies, which had given it birth, were strong enough to nourish it into growth. For a long time, however, it lived and was nursed on the bosom of the Church as a mere BIRTH; growing, indeed, but without a NAME.

The period, during which the new form of the doctrine, as put forth by Radbert, lived thus unnamed, reached from the ninth to the thirteenth Century ; and, as the doctrine itself was yet without the sanction of any council, or decree of the Church, instead of silencing, it rather stimulated Controversy ; for men were yet at liberty to form and express private opinions, even though counter to those, which, on the whole, embodied the mind of the Church. But this long period of comparative liberty drew, at length, to a close. Early in the Thirteenth Century was held the Fourth Council of the Lateran ; and Innocent III. with the reckless audacity that characterized him, strangled all further discussion of this point by pronouncing the opinion of Radbert, as it had grown in shape and strength, to be the only true and orthodox faith on the subject of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament ; and by giving the doctrine—what it had hitherto wanted—a NAME, TRANSUBSTANTIATION. That was the BAPTISM of the Dogma ; and by this name it has ever since been known, as the only tolerated faith, on this point, of the Church of Rome.

But, though discussion on this subject was strangled, yet the minds of men were not all chained. The prodigy, which had thus been nurtured towards maturity, would not lie still. It brought forth corruptions of the Church, on every

side, so deep and dark, as to be continually challenging the scrutiny and the censure of serious and thoughtful men ; until, at last, the strong, though silent workings, which were stirring in their minds, could be no longer repressed. The ever glorious Reformation burst forth, mingling awful thunders with the light, in which it flashed, and shaking terribly the nations, which it was destined to bless. Startled by the shock, Rome at length summoned her famed Council of Trent ; and there, in the Sixteenth Century, not only adopted anew the Dogma of Transubstantiation, but also bound it on the consciences of all her subjects under the terrors of of an anathema, which consigns to endless torments all, who dare to gainsay her decree. That was the CONFIRMATION of the now mature child of Doctrine, in the Church by which it had been bred. We cannot help adding : it may prove a parricidal progeny. In the strength, thus nurtured, it has already traitorously chained, and may, at last, resistlessly destroy, the parent that gave it being. It took Rome seven hundred years to train the prodigy from birth to full communion. It may not take her giant offspring so long to do the parricidal work, for which, with such mistaken fondness, it has apparently been trained.

I have thus traced Transubstantiation from its true parentage,—the doctrine of a literally Real

Presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It could have had no other parentage. The simple words of Christ, "This is my Body ; this is my Blood," interpreted by the laws of His own language as equivalent to the expressions, "This *represents* my Body, this *represents* my Blood ;" the sense, in which they were understood by those first disciples, who, under the guidance of Inspiration, afterwards called the Institution by the unpretending names of "the breaking of bread,"—"The Lord's Supper,"—"The Lord's table,"—those simple words of Christ, thus rightly understood, never could have suggested the unnatural conceptions, in which Radbert so long afterwards embodied the Romish doctrine of this Sacrament. Ages of corrupting ignorance and Superstition, brought in upon the Church by mixture with the philosophy and the impurities of surrounding Paganism, must have gradually perverted and transformed the simple and beautiful Memorial of Himself, which Christ left in His Church, until, at last, it became the mystery and miracle of His literal flesh and blood,—long ages must have wrought thus, before even those mediæval minds, so strangely trained in the subtleties of the Schools, could have conceived the prodigious thought that, by the priestly words of consecration, what had, just before, been mere natural Bread and Wine became,

forthwith, that very Body and Blood of Christ, which the Son of God took of the Virgin, carried to the Cross, and finally raised from the dead ; retaining, in this their awful presence, the mere species, or appearance, of the substances, whose places they had taken. This conception, I repeat, could never have originated in the simple and easily understood words of Christ. Eight hundred years of change and gradual corruption were required to bring in and mature the intensely prolific error of the Real Presence, before even the spoiled mind of man, whetted to acuteness in the most egregious subtleties, and driven by still uneasy common sense to its last shift in maintaining its strange intellectual progeny, could excogitate such an unnatural, such a pernicious dogma as that, finally baptized TRANSUBSTANTIATION : a dogma, in defending and enforcing which on the protesting mind of man Rome has filled the nations with more of error, corruption and cruel bloodshed than have ever flowed from any other single cause.

Why did not the Jews get a similar doctrine of Transubstantiation from the similar words of the Inspired Moses, "This is the Lord's Passover?" Because, they understood the Idiom of their own yet living language ; and because, so long as that Idiom was alive, even their fifteen hundred years of mingled change and error could not breed sub-

tlety enough in their schoolmen, constitutionally imaginative as they were, to misinterpret the simple phrase. For the same reason, the words of Jesus, "This is my Body," could not have been perverted while, as yet, his living language and its Idiom survived. The loss of that Language and its Idiom from the Church by the dispersion of the Jews, the growing corruptions of the old Greek and Latin tongues during the decline of the Empire, the ripened subtleties of the Oriental philosophy caught into the schools and theories of the Church, and the consequently increasing impurity of her whole system, both of faith and of practice,—these things alone can account for the surprising facts, first, of the succession of the doctrine of a literal Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, to that of the primitive "Breaking of Bread in memory of Christ;" and finally, of the conception and coming in of the dogma of Transubstantiation, as the full development of that of a literal Real Presence.

This position may, indeed, be deemed too plain to be contested; yet I think it important thus strenuously to urge attention to it, in order to bring fully before the mind both the nature and the peril of that doctrine of the Real Presence, which is now so industriously taught to many members of our Church. Under my last general head of remark, I noticed an attempt to explain this doctrine

of a Literal Real Presence in the Lord's Supper as if it were something not only harmless, but Scriptural ; while, at the same time, it was made evident that the explanation did but cover the real features of the doctrine from view, as though the time had not then come among us for drawing the veil aside. That time, however, it appears, has since arrived. At least, that veil has been since removed ; though, possibly, the unveiling was at first unintentional. One of the principal authors, so often referred to, has, I think, made it too evident to be longer concealed, that what they mean by their doctrine of a Real Presence in the Lord's Supper is nothing less, and nothing other, than that parent error, which was in the bosom of the Church in the Ninth Century when Radbert gave birth to the unnatural conception of a miraculous *change* in the elements of Bread and Wine ; a change, in consequence of which their substance no longer remained, but gave place, under their mere "species," to that very flesh and blood of Christ, which was then held to be present in the Sacrament ; a change, too, to which Rome has since added little more than officially to give it nurture and a name. This author tells us that what he and his co-authors insist on is, as they term it, that very Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, which was in the Church before the attempt was made to *explain* it

by the Theory of Transubstantiation ; and which has ever since been in the Church, though under the cover of that unfortunate device. His language is as follows :—

“ We do not yield to the Romanists as to the greatness of our privileges ; we do not think that our Lord is less REALLY and spiritually present than they ; that He COMMUNICATES HIMSELF less by His Sacraments than they ; that we less RECEIVE HIS BODY AND BLOOD ; that our sinful bodies are less cleansed by His glorious Body. . . . We do not believe ‘ This is my Body ’ less than they ; we blame them, not as exceeding as to the greatness of the spiritual gift contained in that Sacrament (all human language and thoughts must fall short), but for their carnal conceptions of it ; for attempting to EXPLAIN to man’s senses the mode of his Saviour’s presence ; for trying to solve the apparent contradiction that the elements are still what they were, but are, over and above, to us the Body and Blood of our Lord ; for longing, with the weak faith of Nicodemus, to know the How of things divine and spiritual ; and so, for debasing them, and, by their explanations, leading at least their priesthood to pride, and then to unbelief. . . . Our Church, as holding the original Catholic truth, of which the corruptions of Rome are the debasement, appears to me yet FURTHER REMOVED from

those modern traditions, the inventions of men, who deny the truth. Rome, in this respect, has the truth, though mingled with error, and clouded and injured by it; the Zuingli-Calvinist School have forfeited it. In a word, our Church holds, with Rome, the REALITY of the communication of the Body and Blood of Christ through the holy Eucharist, but denies her carnal way of *explaining* it, and protests against the corruptions thereby entailed; but, in what Rome retains in truth, she "*i. e.* our Church—" must needs hold with her against those, who, explaining to human reason Divine mysteries, cannot but explain away what is mysterious, and resolve the hidden gifts of the Sacrament into aids of contemplation, outward attestations of God's gifts, exhibitions to our outward senses, mere remembrances of His Death."*

That is, these authors being judges, our Church, in the matter of this Sacrament, is nearer Rome than she is to Geneva, and the rest of Continental Protestantism. She holds with Rome the Real Presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament; and that, in the full signification and in all the alleged efficacy of that Presence. She holds that her members receive the very Body and Blood of Christ, as really as the members of the Church of

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bp. of Oxford, N. Y., 1839, pp. 87, 88, 97.

Rome are held to receive them ; and that we receive the same Body and Blood with them. In short, she blames nothing in Rome's view of this mystery but her carnal way of EXPLAINING the mode of the presence, and the corruptions entailed by that explanation. Drop this explanation, throw away the NAME, Transubstantiation, leave the doctrine of the Real Presence, as it was when Radbert undertook "to solve the apparent contradiction" which it involves ; and then, these authors being judges, our Church would have no further fault to find with the views of Rome on this great point.

Here, of a truth, the veil is taken off. These writers hold the doctrine of the Real Presence as Rome holds it ; the presence of the real, literal Christ in His very flesh and blood. They only object to Rome's mode of EXPLAINING that presence, and to the consequences entailed by that explanation. Yet Rome gets her doctrine of the Real Presence, not from the Bible, interpreted by the idiom of Christ's own language, but from the corruptions of a far later age ; an age, in which Christianity had degenerated from its original simplicity into a religion of forms, addressed strikingly to the senses, and operating powerfully on the imagination. In that age, the great parent error of the Church, the notion of a literal Real Presence

grew up ; and all that has since followed has been but the legitimate offspring of that parent.

This, then, it is that makes me so strenuous on this point. Mankind have not been effectively rescued from a strong native bondage to both their senses and their imagination ; nor has human nature yet lost its proneness to superstition ; nor yet has the natural heart lost its fondness for a religion of mere forms ; a religion which appeals luxuriously to the senses, and plays deliciously with the imagination, and which carries with it so much that is imposing and solemn in its ritual as easily to satisfy those, who would gladly have *some* religion, though not prone to one which requires the labor of thought, and the mortification of real deadness to sin and the world. Under this constitution of our fallen and depraved nature, could we suppose the past history of Christianity from the days of Radbert and the opening of the Ninth Century blotted out, and the Church from that point beginning her course anew, with her great parent error of a literal Real Presence already conceived of foregone corruptions, and fashioned into that form merely, in which it was then held ; or, could we suppose this error now, for the first time, conceived, distinctly fashioned, and made the prevalent and deep-seated opinion of the great body of Christians ; and the Church now beginning to move forward on

her way as one great whole, nursing this prolific conception in her mind, fostering it as her grand thought, defending it against opponents, and vindicating it by her authority ; I can have no doubt of the issue that would be reached : the living error could not be confined to its mere conception : it would struggle for the birth, and it would have birth : it would ask expression, and it would have expression : another Radbert would bring it into shape and utterance ; another Innocent would adopt and name it by authority ; and another Council of Trent, in order to hush the remonstrances of reason, and the protestings of the senses, would bind it on the consciences of benighted men under pain of eternal torments. The process, after its first inception, was natural, was unavoidable ; and instead of blaming Rome for bringing it to its issue, we should rather go back, search for the origin of the conception itself, and having found it, seek to expel from the beliefs of the Church the real parent of all this progeny of errors, by showing that the doctrine of the Real Presence is not wrapped up in the simple words of Christ, but was, as we have shown, bred amid the subtle schools and the multiplying corruptions of a far later age.

But, even supposing that this error of a literal Real Presence were not—though undoubtedly it is—so vitally prolific as again to force all the pro-

digious births which have heretofore followed it ; who, I ask, that has any just appreciation of the Gospel, and of the preciousness of its great salvation through faith in Christ and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, would be willing to take the Church of the Ninth Century as his pattern of faith and practice in the matter of the Lord's Supper ? Who can be desirous of committing our branch of the Church to the fearful hazards of carrying in her Creed such a live error as that which we have examined ; of seeing that error continually struggling to multiply itself, and kept from self-multiplication by nothing but apparent accident ; while even the unmultiplied energies of that one error are sufficient to infect the whole body of associated truths, and to place the religion of our Church at but a slight remove from corruptions of the grossest and most pernicious character ? Such, however, is the peril, into which we are now running, and which we shall inevitably realize, if the notion of a literal Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ should ever become the deliberately adopted, the generally received, and the heartily defended doctrine of our own Protestant Episcopal Church. What, then, shall we say, in view of the moral certainty, that greater peril than this would be ours, if the error, which we are asked to embrace, should ever become general among us ; that

this error is vitally prolific, and cannot be kept from self-multiplication? Long ages, indeed, might be required for training its progeny to maturity; but those ages would at length come round again: and our posterity would find themselves returned and clasped to the very bosom of those deep corruptions, from which our ancestors, at the period of the Reformation, broke and fled away with horror.

3. After having dwelt thus long on the character of these two offspring of the doctrine of a literal Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, I shall not attempt to name and describe all their remaining kindred, but will draw this part of the subject to a close by a brief reference to two of the most conspicuous; I mean, the Traffic in Masses, and the Worship of the Host.

The TRAFFIC IN MASSES sprang naturally from the notion of *a Sacrifice* for the remission of sins, both of the living and of the dead, as brought into the Sacrament by the doctrine of the Real Presence. If there be such a Sacrifice in the Sacrament, and if the remission of sin be conveyed in its reception; then, what can be more natural than for poor, darkened sinners to seek the benefit AT ANY EXPENSE; and to seek it thus for the quicker release from purgatorial pains of the baptized DEAD, as well as for the greater ease in their sins of the

baptized LIVING? The purchase of Salvation is the very thing, which of all others best suits the pride of the natural heart ; and all history, Pagan as well as Christian, teaches that men can be made willing, if not glad, to part with rich patrimonies, and to make themselves miserable mendicants, under the delusive dream of thereby meriting and purchasing the salvation of their souls. Thus the traffic in Masses was at length introduced ; and thus by degrees, the Church, found herself in possession of the means of amassing wealth, which, had not the Reformation in a measure broken up that traffic, would have finally brought her into the splendid peril of having literally "gained the whole world, and lost thereby her own soul." This peril may now never be realized ; and yet, even the notion of a Sacrifice in the Sacrament for the remission of sin, at the discretion of an earthly priesthood, as now so earnestly taught, may, if sufficiently fostered and patronized, become the means of bringing into our Church an amount of Corporate wealth, which would make her practically one of "the kingdoms of this world," in deadly conflict with the spiritual kingdom of the temporally poor and unportioned Jesus.

The "WORSHIP OF THE HOST," that is, the adoration of the elements in their supposed transubstantiated state, as the very Body and Blood of

Christ, elevated with awful solemnity in view of prostrate multitudes, sprang, of course, directly from Transubstantiation itself; as the Traffic in masses did from the doctrine of a Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. The impulse to worship, in deep prostration, the supposed present and visible Deity was natural, not to say irresistible. But—over this amazing issue of the corruptions, bred by the error of a Literal Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Lord's Supper, I willingly throw a veil. I have neither time nor love for the scenes which would be unfolded, if the examination of this part of the subject were to be pressed. I will merely add, that, for overpowering splendor and magnificence, and for awful impressiveness and effect, the elevation and worship of the Host is a show, which casts the greatest brilliancy of Imperial pomp into shade; that, for deep impiety and blasphemy, it is a ceremony, which outvies the rankest and tallest Idolatry of Paganism itself; and that, as the unquestionable ultimate product of the error, which we have been considering, it shows, perhaps more plainly and strikingly than anything else, the essentially vital and irrepressibly prolific energy with which that error has wrought on the human mind, and with which, wherever cherished, it ever will work.

The notion of a literal Real Presence of the

Body and Blood of Christ in the elements of the Lord's Supper leads to the multiplication of error just as naturally and as necessarily as sin leads to the multiplication of evils in the moral condition of our nature. Were it not that the light of the Bible has probably become too strong in our Protestant Church ever to be again entirely put out, this doctrine, fully developed and cordially cherished, would rapidly carry us back to the very darkness, from which we have so long since emerged. And even now, blessed as this Church is with the true light, that doctrine is capable of wrapping the "deceitful and desperately wicked hearts" of men in a darkness as fatally, if not as grossly dark as that of the middle ages themselves. Hence it is, that men, otherwise intelligent and wise, and even amiable and virtuous, are found yielding to the approaches of an error, the form of which, in the dimness and shadowyness of their religious conceptions, they do not distinctly recognize, or the imposing impressiveness of which, in its address to their senses, takes well with their love of a religion, which, dispensing with the labor of thought and with the necessity of a real and utter deadness to sin and the world, gives them up to impulse and to the dreamy luxury of wondering imagination.

One of the most dangerous aspects of this error, as now presented to us, is, that it is, for the

present, associated with much sound and wholesome truth ; truth earnestly held and fervently told ; and with much purity and austerity of character in its principal teachers. Its advantages for self-propagation are hence easily apparent, and our obligations to guard against its spread are immensely increased : for the most fatal seductions from the way of truth and life may have their beginnings amid a real increase of zeal and devotedness to some of the minor things of religion, especially when outward circumstances favor a backward movement from the restless activities and the sometimes apparent changefulness of the public mind, stimulated by the spirit of intense inquiry, and heaving amid the throes of incessant progress.

CHAPTER III.

SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER STATED AND ILLUSTRATED.

THE various passages in the New Testament, which in any way touch upon the nature of the Lord's Supper, have already been examined. In what I have thus far said, indeed, my object has been to refute an erroneous view of this Sacrament, rather than fully to exhibit what I regard as the true one. This, however, may easily be gathered from what has been advanced ; for, if the interpretations, which have been given of the language of Christ in John vi., and in His instituting words themselves, be correct, they not only refute the error, which has been indicated, but also throw a distinctly guiding light upon the only question, that remains : What is the true Idea of the Lord's Supper ? What was Christ's intention, and what is the Christian's act, in this Sacrament ? The answer to this question I shall now, as was, in the fourth and last place, proposed, proceed to gather, primarily

from what we have found in the Bible, and subordinately from what we may find in the language of our Liturgy and offices.

IV. By way of introducing this answer, it will be well to recur, for a moment, to the principal points established by the interpretations, to which I have referred.

According to those interpretations, then, the language of Christ in John vi., where, after having fed the five thousand, He speaks of "giving His Flesh for the life of the world," and of our "eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood," refers, not to the Sacrament, nor to sacramental eating and drinking, but to HIMSELF, as the only Saviour, and to our receiving of Him, by FAITH, unto salvation and eternal life. In what He said there was no allusion to a then future Cross, as that on which His great work of atonement was to be consummated. He simply refers to our reception of Him by faith as the only Saviour; and this reception He explains as "coming to Him," and "seeing the Son" with the true spiritual discernment of those, who are taught of God," and who thus "learn" and are "drawn" of "the Father." In short, the Language of Christ refers to HIMSELF, as the true Bread from Heaven, which nourisheth unto everlasting life; and to that all-deciding reconciliation between the soul and her Saviour, in which the

penitent sinner, in the viewless movements of his inner man, is "taught" and "drawn" by the Spirit of the Father and His word of Truth; and in which, thus "taught" and "drawn," he voluntarily yields his heart to Christ and receives Him **BY FAITH**, as his only, all-sufficient, life-giving Saviour; a reconciliation, which lies at the very beginning of the true, inward Christian life, and which, in every real Christian, precedes, or should precede, his first sacramental commemoration of his Saviour's Death.

According to the same interpretations, the words of Christ, in instituting His Sacramental Supper, teach, not the Real Presence of the Body of Christ in the sacramental elements, but the symbolic, representative character of those elements and of the Divine Rite in which they are used. Those words are, in truth, exactly equivalent to the following, which I give again as a fair paraphrase of His language and of St. Paul's comment thereon: "Take, eat and drink this Bread and this Wine; they **REPRESENT** my Body and my Blood, which, according to the tenor of the New Covenant, are to be given in Sacrifice for the sins of the world: eat and drink thus in **MEMORY** of me:" "for, as oft as ye do this, ye do celebrate the Lord's Death; a celebration, which is to be perpetuated until the period of His final coming."

The ground of the foregoing interpretations has been stated at sufficient length ; and I venture to think that ground wholly unassailable.

1. I come, then, to the question, what is the view, which these interpretations give of the primary nature of this Christian Ordinance ? Bring together, as thus interpreted, the only expressions which bear on this question. "Take, eat this *Bread* ; it *represents* my Body." "Drink ye all of this *cup*. It *represents* my Blood." "Do this in *remembrance* of me." "As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do *celebrate* the Lord's Death." In what light do these expressions place the nature of this Sacrament ? I answer ; they place it in a light, which shines with broad and resistless demonstration on this conclusion ; that, in its primary, and most obvious attribute, the Lord's Supper is—LOVE'S MEMORIAL of the bodily absent Jesus, and of that work of conquering mercy, in which He achieved on the Cross the salvation of sinners. It is such a memorial, divinely *ordained*, and therefore divinely *obligatory*. The *breaking* of the Bread, and the *pouring* of the wine represent the fact and the manner of the Death of Christ ; as the Bread and the wine themselves represent His Body and His Blood ;—and the Christian's *reception* of the consecrated elements represents the act of *receiving* Christ as the only

Saviour from sin. Christians partake of the Bread and the Wine in **LOVING MEMORY** of Him who died for their sins : whenever they do so, they celebrate, or proclaim, the fact and the truth of His Death and Sacrifice ; and to a perpetuation of this *memorial* they are bound with the cords of *Love* by the command of Him, who is Lord both of death and of life. This, I repeat, is the Lord's Supper in its primary and most obvious attribute. On Christ's part, it is a Divinely obligatory **MEMORIAL**, and, on the Christian's part, a Divinely obligatory **COMMEMORATION** of that wondrous work, in which the glorious Lord of life gave His Body and His Blood on the Cross, as an atoning Sacrifice for sin. This is the most palpable meaning of all that He said at the time of the institution of the Rite, as recorded by the three evangelists, one of whom was His eye and ear Witness, while the other two are His inspired historians. This, in like manner, is the most palpable meaning of what He said after His ascension into Heaven, when He specially revealed the instituting words to St. Paul, as recorded in the first Epistle to the Corinthians. It is worthy of observation that, both at the original institution, and at the subsequent revelation of the instituting words, He not only said the same things in the main, but also, on both occasions, spake in such a way as to leave the **MEMORIAL** character of the Rite

its most observable feature ; to show that His leading purpose, in ordaining the sacred Supper, was—to leave in His Church, embalmed, as it were, in the spirit of undying LOVE, an imperishable MEMORIAL of His bodily absent Person, and of that marvelous act, for which He came down from Heaven,—the act of making Himself “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world ;” and to leave that memorial, as a gathering-point, around which, till His coming again, His faithful Disciples should statedly assemble for *social* communion and *loving* fellowship in the infinitely rich blessings of the Gospel. In connection with this first view of the Ordinance, several things deserve more particular attention.

(1.) In the writings, to which I have so often referred in this discussion, much is said about the deep and awful MYSTERY, involved in the nature of this Ordinance ; nor do I wish to detract from its true character as one of the great Christian mysteries ; but it is desirable to know in what sense the Lord’s Supper is a mystery. A thing may be a mystery without being incomprehensible. In the New Testament, the word, Mystery, has several senses, subordinate, indeed, to one general signification. In its general sense, it means something “*shut up*,” *secret*. In its subordinate senses, it means, 1.) Something thus “secret” because it can-

not be known ; because it is, in its very nature, "shut up," incomprehensible, at least in the present state and to our finite minds. Such is "the mystery of God, even of the Father and of Christ ;" Col. 2 : 2 ; called elsewhere, "the mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the flesh ;" 1 Tim. 3 : 16 ; the, to us, absolutely inscrutable union of the Father and of Christ ; to us the literally incomprehensible mystery of the Incarnation. 2.) Something "secret," because not *revealed* ; though, when revealed, easily comprehended. Such was once "the mystery *kept secret* from the beginning of the world ;" "hid in God," but "made manifest," when Christ came and "revealed" it ;—viz. : the mystery that His Gospel should be preached to all nations, "Gentiles" as well as Jews ; Rom. 16 : 25, 26 ; Eph. 3 : 3–6, 9 ; Col. 1 : 26, 27 ; 4 : 3, 4. And 3.) Something intentionally kept from common knowledge and profane use ; sacred to the holy, though not necessarily difficult to be understood. Such were the "mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven," Matt. 13 : 10, 11, which, in the plain teachings of Christ, "it was given" to the disciples "to know ;" but which were designedly concealed from the perverse Jews by the veils of parable. In this last sense, the Christian Sacrament may be called A MYSTERY. It is a sacred and richly significant Symbol, designedly kept from common and pro-

fane use ; a pledge of love reserved as the exclusive privilege of the people of God ; a holy thing, not to be handled by the wicked, ordinarily not understood by them ; and yet, not difficult to be understood by those, who desire to know and enjoy it. In this sense, too, it may be considered as included among the truths of the Gospel in what St. Paul says to the Corinthians, when he characterizes "the ministers of Christ" as "Stewards of the mysteries of God." I say, it may be considered as included among the truths of the Gospel, because, evidently the Sacraments do not comprise the whole of those "mysteries," of which Christ's ministers are made "Stewards." These mysteries embrace everything, with which those ministers are intrusted, and primarily, without doubt, those rich, though in the main intelligible truths of Christianity, which it is their chief office to unfold and dispense to the Church and to the world. And such being the case, there is no more reason for considering the Sacraments of Christ as involving incomprehensible mysteries, than there is for considering the ordinary truths of Christianity as involving incomprehensible mysteries. Some of these truths are, indeed, incomprehensible, absolutely so to finite minds. Such are the truths of the Trinity and the Incarnation. Others of them are so. in the sense of being unfathomable by the

line of our understanding, though we can fathom them to great depths, and find them beautifully clear and comprehensible as far down as that line will reach. Such are the truths of an atonement, of election, of free-will, and of a particular Providence. Many, however, of the truths of the Gospel are not only partially, but also wholly intelligible ; that is, when looked into, they are clear as light, and bring their objects before our minds in full distinctness and beauty ; and yet these, as well as the others, are included among " the mysteries of God," of which the ministers of Christ are made " Stewards."

In the light of what has now been said, place the mystery of the Lord's Supper. It is a mystery in two of the senses above indicated. The truth of an atonement, as one of the principal, to which this Sacrament points, is mysterious in this sense, that, though we can see far into it, and see it thus far clear and comprehensible, yet we cannot see to the bottom of it. Even this character, however, of the important truth indicated, does not make the Lord's Supper itself a mystery in the sense of being an incomprehensible thing. Were the truth indicated absolutely incomprehensible, this would not make the Sacrament itself incomprehensible. A Symbol may be a very intelligible thing, even though that, of which it is a Symbol, were abso-

lutely beyond the grasp of the human understanding. Thus, the Trinity is to us absolutely incomprehensible ; yet a Symbol of the Trinity may be quite intelligible. Much more is this true, when the truth symbolized is, to a great extent, beautifully clear and beneficially understood.

Again ; the Lord's Supper is a precious mystery, as one of the holy things intrusted to the stewardship of Christ's ministers ; as one of those divine privileges designedly kept sacred to the saints ; as one of those consecrated things, which are not to be handled, or touched by profane and wicked hands. It is a richly significant, and inestimably precious gift ; and yet, in its primary and most obvious meaning, it is a thing clearly and beautifully intelligible. The obvious design of Christ, on "the night in which He was betrayed," was, to leave among His disciples an affecting MEMORIAL of His expiatory sufferings, and atoning Death ; a Memorial never to be forgotten, and never to be looked on without understandingly recalling both the event itself and the vital meaning of the event, which it was ordained to commemorate. But it is not a mystery in the sense of embodying that awful and incomprehensible secret of the Real Presence of the very flesh and blood of Christ, which, in a sort of miraculously mechanical way, we know not how, develops within us the previously communi-

cated Divine nature ; nor is it a mystery in the sense of furnishing an impenetrable cover for holding in "reserve" the great doctrine of Atonement, as something which was designed to be exhibited but sparingly to the common gaze. On the contrary, it is a Symbol, designed to hold up that truth in its most affecting light, and to exhibit it in its most touching power. The elements themselves in the Symbol, the Bread broken, and the Wine poured out, by Christ's command, represent His Atoning Sacrifice, offered once for all upon the Cross ; and the Christian's reception of those consecrated emblems represents his own act in receiving the Atonement, in feeding on Christ by faith, in believing on Him as the Son of God, the only Saviour of lost men ; while, at the same time, it constitutes his affectionate commemoration of that "precious Death," through which he ventures to hope for life. In all this, however much there may be that is unsearchable in the Love, commemorated, there is nothing incomprehensible in the Memorial, by which that Love is kept in mind. It is a rich Mystery, as holding up the most affecting of truths, in a light the most beautiful ; and as presenting us with a privilege to be kept sacred to the children of God ; but, as Christ's Institution, kept alive by the blessing of the Spirit on the Christian's observance, it is a luminously intelligible ordinance.

(2.) On the character of the Lord's Supper, as a **MEMORIAL** of his Death and Passion, our Communion office is in full accord with the language of Christ. Let us, for a moment, look at this point.

In the notice given of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the officiator proposes "to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ; to be by them received in **REMEMBRANCE** of his meritorious Cross and Passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven." This passage is valuable, not only as showing that the Sacrament is a Memorial, a **REMEMBRANCER**, but also as contradicting the doctrine, formerly noticed, that this Sacrament "conveys" remission of post-baptismal sins. "We obtain remission of our sins," not in and by the mystery of this Sacrament, but by Christ's "meritorious Cross and Passion **ALONE**;" and our reception of this Sacred Rite is but a "Remembrance," a Memorial, of that precious Sacrifice.

Again : in the "Exhortation," at the time of the celebration of the Rite, occurs this language : "And, to the end that we should always **REMEMBER** the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us ; and the innumerable benefits, which by His precious blood-shedding

He hath obtained for us, He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual REMEMBRANCE of His death, to our great and endless comfort." Here we are taught that the design of Christ's "precious bloodshedding" was, to "obtain for us innumerable benefits;" while the end, for which His holy Supper was instituted, was, to furnish us "pledges of His love, for a continual Remembrance," a perpetual Memorial "of His Death."

Again: in "the prayer of Consecration," after an adoring reference to God's "tender mercy in giving His only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption," it is added: that Christ "did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual MEMORY of that His precious death and Sacrifice." Here the same distinction is kept up; Christ's Sacrifice on the Cross, our only hope of eternal Life; His holy Supper, the great MEMORIAL of that Sacrifice. So, in the same prayer, when we come to "the Oblation," and to the doing of what Christ requires of us in the ordinance, we have this language: "According to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make, here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the MEMORIAL Thy Son hath commanded us

to make ; having in REMEMBRANCE His most blessed Passion and precious Death." Here, to make our act accord with Christ's institution, nothing is specified but the offering up of the great MEMORIAL of what Christ hath done upon the Cross for our Redemption.

Once more ; in the actual delivery of the consecrated elements to the recipient, putting for brevity's sake the two sentences into one, we have these important words : "The Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were given and shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take, eat and drink these in REMEMBRANCE that Christ died, and that His blood was shed, for thee ; and feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving." It is important to dwell upon these words, because the Theory of the Real Presence has put on them a gloss, which is not justified by their true import. To exhibit that gloss and this import, I know of no better way than to paraphrase the words just read, according to the two views of the Lord's Supper, which have been exhibited. The Theory of the Real Presence would be obliged to paraphrase them thus :

"As a Priest at the Altar of Christ, and by His mysterious power, I 'convey' to thee with these 'hands' and 'together with these signs' the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, which were

given and shed for thee, and which are here truly present, and 'in continuance' still given and shed. They shall Preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life by becoming 'commingled and co-united' with both, making them 'one substance with Him,' and 'preserving both for incorruption.' Eat and drink these signs, together with the very flesh and blood which they signify and convey, in remembrance that Christ died, and that His blood was shed for thee ; and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

Between the latter and the former part of this paraphrase there is, indeed, an apparent discrepancy ; since it shows the communicant to be receiving the consecrated emblems in MEMORY of what is really PRESENT. Still, it is the only paraphrase that I am able to put on the passage, drawing from the language, which from time to time has been quoted, and in which the Theory of the Real Presence is stated in the words of its own advocates.

And now, let us see how the View of the Lord's Supper, which I am illustrating, in distinction from that of the Real Presence, would require us to paraphrase the words in question. The paraphrase would evidently run thus :

"As a minister of Christ, acting in His name and by His authority, I devoutly and fervently pray that the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,

which were given and shed for thee, may preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, by being made to thee the meritorious cause of a free and full forgiveness of all thy sins, and of the future resurrection of thy body from the dead. Take, eat and drink these consecrated symbols of His great Sacrifice and Salvation, as the Divinely ordained MEMORIAL of His precious death and passion, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

I am not now engaged in the direct argument against the doctrine of the Real Presence ; and yet I think it impossible to look upon the foregoing paraphrases of the words of our Communion Service at the delivery of the elements, without seeing that they embody an argument of very cogent power against that doctrine and in favor of the view, which I have begun to present. Here, as well as in the previous quotations from the Communion Service, we see preserved the vital distinction between Christ's meritorious Sacrifice on the Cross, and the intelligible MEMORIAL of it, which He has ordained for our observance in the Church ; while here, with even unusual distinctness, the nature of our act, in keeping the Memorial, is set forth as a "feeding on Him in THE HEART, by FAITH ;"—in the heart ; that is, with fervent love in return for His love unquenchable : and by faith ; that is, with

a believing appropriation of that Sacrifice on the Cross, to which His love hath prompted.

Place the two views side by side, and tell me, which looks most like the Gospel—Is it the attitude, assumed in the former paraphrase, by the Priest at the Altar ; or that, assumed in the latter paraphrase. by the commissioned minister of Jesus ? In the former, stands up the Priest at his Sacrifice, “intrusted with the awful gift of making the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ ;” and, having exercised that gift, he proceeds to ‘convey’ with his ‘hands’ the sign and the thing signified, the emblems and the very flesh and blood of the present Christ ; as that unutterable mystery, which, by ‘co-union’ with the body and soul of the recipient, is to ‘preserve both for incorruption’ and everlasting life. In the latter, appears the servant of Jesus, commissioned to minister for Him in Word, in Prayer and in Ordinances ; and, having reverently set apart the appointed elements to the sacred office of representing, in Divine Symbol, the atoning Sacrifice on the Cross, he proceeds to deliver them to his fellow-Christians, with the fervent petition that the Body and Blood of Christ, which they represent, being received in *faith* and *love*, may insure to his *body* a resurrection, and to his *soul* a Redemption, unto life eternal.

Which of these attitudes, I again ask, is Script-

ural?—Which is conceived in the spirit of the Gospel?—Would not any serious and intelligent student of the Bible, who was at the same time a careful observer of his own nature, feel that the former of these two attitudes belongs to a religion, which addresses itself, with thrilling energy, to the senses and the imagination ; to all the strong, in-born tendencies of man to superstition and to a perilous reliance upon forms ; a religion, which proposes to do its work by mysteries, operating upon awed and prostrate minds, and encouraging a passive receptivity, in which thought lies still amid the excitement of the senses and under the overmasterings of wonder ; in a word, a religion, which tends to exalt its priesthood into the rank of an almost super-human caste, and to depress its subjects to the level of beings, who bow with unquestioning submission to mere authority and to overpowering prerogative? On the contrary, would not such a student and observer feel that the latter of the two attitudes belongs to a religion, which addresses itself, with instructive power, to the reason and the understanding ; to the faith and the love of the Christian ; to all that is capable in man of being raised into a Worship full of light and of love ; a religion, which, by the teaching of intelligible symbols, in harmony with intelligible doctrines, leads the mind away to the marvelous

acts and the glorious truths symbolized and taught, and there, through a speaking MEMORIAL, awakens thought, and kindles meditation, and calls up the whole soul to the activity of grasping, embracing and realizing the work and the power of Christ's divinely rational, though unfathomable Love ; in short, a religion, which shows its Ministry, though in the midst of unusually holy things, still intelligently holding forth the one Gospel of our salvation ; and its subjects, though receiving an unusually solemn ministry, yet receiving it into earnest minds as well as into yielding hearts, and voluntarily co-operating with the grace of the Divine Spirit, as well as reverently honoring the claims of the Divine commission, under which this grace is proffered ?

I feel that the above is not too strong a statement of the difference between the tendency of this Sacrament, when considered as involving the unscriptural Mystery of the Real Presence of the very Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Elements, and its tendency, when considered as embodying the Scriptural mystery of a Memorial of the great Sacrifice, once offered on the Cross.

(3.) But, let us look a moment at the reason, why Christ left this Memorial in His Church ; and why He gave its character, as a Memorial. such prominence in His instituting words.

As the Divine Son of God, Christ came into the world and mysteriously took upon Him our nature, for the purpose of representing, in that mystery, the reconciliation between offending man and his offended God ; and of consummating that work of atonement by Sacrifice, through which this reconciliation was to be effected. He came, moreover, to teach that Divine System of Truth, of which He is at once the fountain and the subject, and to institute that simple and decent body of Rites, which should be appropriate to the Church of God in passing from a Dispensation of shadows to a Dispensation of light. And then, having completed His work, He returned to the Father ; and there, in the presence of the heavenly hosts, exhibited, in the union of His glorified Humanity with His ever-glorious Divinity, a living pledge and a life-giving Symbol of that beneficent result, which He went to achieve—the reconciliation between rebellious men and a forgiving God.

Before He took His departure, however, from our world, He was specially careful to do what might be done for the comfort and support of His disciples, and, after them, of His whole Church, under His bodily absence. **BODILY**, He was to be present with them no longer, until the time of His final coming to judge the Earth. Encompassed by a hostile world, they were to labor in the work of

spreading the Gospel, without the support of his personal, bodily presence. They needed, therefore, somewhat to sustain and cheer them in their perilous toils and under their painful privations. And this need He graciously supplied. He was divinely thoughtful of their case. "I will not leave you comfortless," were his words of sympathizing love. But, what at that period of tender solicitude did he do?

In the first place, just before His departure, He revealed to His disciples those grand and precious truths, which had before been but little the subjects of His teachings; such as His own essential oneness with the Father, their spiritual union with Himself; His purpose to prepare for them heavenly mansions in His Father's house, and to receive them finally to a participation of His own glory, with that Father; the certainty that prayer offered in His name should be answered, and that their efforts in gathering His flock out of the world should be crowned with success; and the assurance of a peculiar manifestation of Himself to them, which the world could not comprehend, and in which the world should have no share,—a joint dwelling of the Father and the Son in their hearts, as a token of favor to those who should keep His commandments, and as realized in the sweet comforts of *MUTUAL LOVE* between Him and His obe-

dient followers,—the precious legacy of His own Divine, inward, heartfelt **PEACE**, that Peace which the world could neither give nor take away. All these are grand and precious truths indeed ; and their revelation at such a season of tender regards must have come with a mightily compensating power upon their saddened hearts while beating so strangely with the thought of His approaching absence.

This, however, was not all that He did at that period of special interest. In the next place, as a sweetly compensating substitute for Himself during His long bodily absence, He promised the coming of the gracious **COMFORTER**, “The Spirit of Truth” from the Father, to “guide them into all truth,” to “glorify” the absent Saviour by “receiving” from Him and “showing” to them the riches—“the unsearchable riches of Christ,” and by working mightily in their labors for the salvation of men by “convincing the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment.” This promised **COMFORTER**, in all His sweet and powerful workings, was a still more abundant compensation for the absence, which they were brought to anticipate. Truly the Master was divinely thoughtful of His disciples’ needs.—Truly, He did not “leave them comfortless.” Truly, in His Word revealed and in His Spirit sent, He did “come to them” with most abundant consolations. [See John, xiv. xv. xvi. xvii.]

But, even this was not all, that He did to demonstrate the Divine thoughtfulness of His Love. Having revealed to His disciples all those cheering, sustaining and comforting Truths, and having promised and sent the Holy Spirit to fill all those truths with power and sweetness ;—He added still another gift,—a gift, which had a still more special reference to His own approaching bodily absence. And now the question is,—what was this still more special substitute for His accustomed Presence ?—The Theory, which we have been examining, shapes the answer thus. He left HIMSELF, by a literal Presence, in His Sacrament. He perpetuated a literal INCARNATION of Himself in his Church ; so that, though absent to sight, He is still present in substance. He made His Church a live incarnation of Himself in a new form ; a living Body, endowed once for all with the full gift of the Spirit, and clothed once for all with the sole prerogative and power of communicating both Himself and the gifts of that Spirit, in perpetual succession, to those who thus become His members. Such is the Theory of the Incarnation, as developed by various writers, who once called themselves Protestants.—It is a Theory. which, in many cases, has already consistently developed its advocates into avowed Papists ; and which, if logically followed, would, in all cases, develop its advocates into open adherents to the

Mother of all corruptions both in faith and in practice. It is, I venture to affirm, a shaping of the Theory, which could have come from no other source than the workings of sense and imagination under the power of old Superstition ; producing, first, the conception of a veritable Real Presence in the Sacrament ; and next the birth of actual Transubstantiation ; and finally seeking, by the assumed infallibility of a Conciliary Decree, to defend against reasoning remonstrance, and to entail upon unquestioning credulity, the monster Prodigy thus brought forth. It is a shape of the Theory, which could never have come from the BIBLE. It is an Incarnation, with which FACT, as well as Scripture, is at war. Christ spake in good faith, when He foretold to His disciples His approaching departure from the world and return to the Father, and His consequent bodily absence from His followers ; a departure and absence, in consequence of which they "should see Him no more," because, **BODILY**, He was no longer to be with them. "I go to my Father," said He, "and ye see me no more." . . . "And now, I am no more in the world ; but these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep through Thine own name those, whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. While I was with them in the world I kept them in Thy name." . . . "And now I come to

Thee." All this, I repeat, was in good faith, and foretold, till the time of his final coming, a total **BODILY ABSENCE** from the Church. There was, it is true, a sense, in which His disciples were still to "see Him," even after His departure. It was that sense, in which "the world saw Him not," because they loved Him not, and kept not His commandments.—In the visions of **FAITH**, and with the heart of **LOVE**, they still saw Him because **HE LIVED**, and because **THEY LIVED, ALSO**, a spiritual life capable of loving Him, and obeying Him, and thus of enjoying inward tokens of His favor and fellowship. But, **BODILY**, they saw Him not, simply because, in honest truth, He was, **BODILY**, "no more in the world."—In every sense, which these words could cover, He was withdrawn from the Church, and the Spirit came, another Comforter, in His stead. Nothing but the power of a prolific Error could ever, with the Scriptures in view, have conceived and developed the idea that, after His visible withdrawal. Christ still left **HIMSELF** incarnate, under another form, in the Body of His Church; empowering this Body, once for all, to communicate Himself and His Spirit, solely through the sources of miraculous and life-giving Sacraments. Not only is the Theory utterly unscriptural, but the mischiefs of the Theory are absolutely incalculable. It is an exhaustless fountain of corruption, and

the broad base of an intolerable Spiritual Despotism.

If, then, Christ did not thus leave Himself incarnate in His Church, what was that one thing more, which He did leave to His disciples in addition to the promised Comforter, and which was to have a still more special reference to His own entire bodily absence? I reply: It was a sacred MEMORIAL of Himself in His last Supper; that divinely significant representation of the sublime act, in which His whole work of Redemption was about to close. His Body, spiritualized and glorified, was about to ascend into heaven, never more to reside substantially in His Church until the period of His final coming, or until His Church should come to dwell personally with Him in His future kingdom. Instead of Himself, He left this precious Memorial of Himself, this divinely instituted Symbol of His Body and Blood, as that Body and Blood were exhibited in His last wondrous office in the work of their Redemption. He did not leave His Body to reside unseen in the present Memorial; but He left the Memorial to represent to sight His absent Body. He left, not Himself in the Memorial, but, a Memorial of Himself.

And, in doing this, He acted with a plain and wise reference to one of the most deep-laid and certainly operative principles of our nature; that,

by which LOVE seeks to keep the absent in mind, and mutual affection alive by asking and giving **TOKENS** of Love, **PLEDGES** of affection. He performed an act, which every spiritually enlightened follower would be sure to understand and feel. He knew that, whenever and wherever the light of the Gospel shone purely, the Memorial-token, which He left, as often as it should be brought forth and exhibited amid the solemnities of His worship, would bring the absent Saviour to mind with unwonted vividness, and thus prove a sweet quickener of His disciples' love ; that it would be the gathering point of their freshly awakened affections ; the sacred pledge, around which their holiest feelings would cluster, and mingle, and glow, and burn, as they realized with quickened sensibility the beauties and the glories of His once marred but now perfect form in connection with the work of their own wondrous Redemption. Hence, His repeated precept, "Do this in **REMEMBRANCE** of me ;" and hence His Apostle's comment, "As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do **SHOW** the Lord's death till He come."

In its leading, most obvious feature, then, this Ordinance is LOVE's **MEMORIAL** of the Bodily absent Jesus, and of that work of conquering mercy on the Cross, in which He achieved the salvation of sinners ; and the beautiful wisdom of such a memorial

is clearly manifest when we consider the essential spirit and the peculiar glory of that religion, which Christ came to teach and to exemplify. What is that religion? Open the Bible, and its pure light flashes from every page. It is a Spirit of HOLY LOVE. This brought Christ from Heaven. This lived and struggled, acted and suffered, in all that He said and in all that He did on earth. This makes the groans, and the darkness, and the mysteries and the miracles of Calvary vocal with sweet sounds, radiant with soft lights, clear with a Divine meaning, and instinct with unearthly power. This knits true Christians into one living Body, full of the sweet peace of Heaven. And this, when perfected, is to be the secret of their all-conquering prevalence over the hostility and the persecutions of a wicked world. It is LOVE, that godlike temper, which never refuses to act, to sacrifice, or to suffer, in the work of promoting the conversion of sinful men to Christ. With what divine propriety, then, did Christ make His last and highest ordinance in the Church an appeal to His disciples' LOVE, and thus, a means of quickening and perpetuating this holy sympathy with Himself and with all that were to bear both His name and His image. Divine token from a most compassionate Saviour! Sacred sign of the only true Sacrifice! May it never fail of the end, for which

it has been given. May it be cherished and kept pure and uninjured until all mankind be knit together in LOVE, and brought, with one heart, to circle it in sweetest MEMORY of Him, who LOVED them unto DEATH.

(4.) With the account thus given of the leading feature of this ordinance, there are no places in the New Testament, which do not readily harmonize. Take that, so often quoted in support of the opposite view, in which St. Paul reprov'd the sensual Corinthians for "eating and drinking unworthily:" and in which he uses the following well-known, energetic language: "Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord;"—and "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. 11 : 27–29. Where, say the advocates of the Real Presence, were the peculiar sin and peril of eating and drinking unworthily, save on the ground that the wicked, in doing so, discern not the holy thing, which is really, however invisibly, present, the very body and blood of Christ, and thus become guilty of that body and blood, and find that they have received the Sacrament of it not unto life, but unto death? "This real spiritual Presence it is," says one, "which makes it so awful a thing to approach unworthily. . . . On no theory,

whereby the sacred elements should be mere representations, or signs, or pledges, or tokens of an absent thing, or means to kindle our faith, would the unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist be so much more dreadful than profane conduct in Church, where also Christ is in 'the midst of us.' All which the Scripture says of this case, 'not discerning the Lord's body,' 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' implies an IMMEDIATE, unseen presence of that body, which the wicked discern not, cannot partake of, but offend against; and so 'eat and drink judgment to themselves,' in that they eat and drink the Sacrament of so great a thing."*

To this I might answer many things; but it will be enough to say, first, that St. Paul does not affirm that unworthy eating and drinking at the Lord's Table *is* 'more dreadful than profane conduct in Church,' where also Christ is 'in the midst of us.' He shows, indeed, that unworthy eating and drinking is a great and perilous sin; but he was not comparing this with the sin of profane conduct in Church; and therefore he does not tell us which is the more dreadful of the two. If he had been discoursing on the point of this comparison, perhaps he would have said as thrillingly severe things against the latter sin as he has said against

* Pusey's Letter to the Bp. of Oxford, N. Y., 1839, pp. 86, 87.

the former. This is the more probable, because he was not so familiar, as some have since been, with the distinction between great sins and little sins, mortal sins and venial sins ; but was rather in the habit of looking upon sin as simply SIN, and upon ALL sin as "exceeding sinful ;" and because he has told us of one sin, which is at least as sinful as that of unworthy eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper, even on this writer's Theory of comparative 'dreadfulness.' Those, who "fall away" from the beginnings of grace, whether by profane conduct in Church, or by indulgence in some very respectable habit of worldliness, or by any other mode of careless living, he says, "CRUCIFY to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." Heb. 6 : 6. In truth, all the open sins of professing Christians are of this dreadful sinfulness. In the sense intended by St. Paul, they "crucify the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame." Even the profane conduct of the wicked in the House of God is one of the most flagrant outrages, that can be committed, against that Divine Saviour, who is graciously pleased to be spiritually present in the midst of His worshiping people.

But, second, even allowing that St. Paul had intended to represent the act of unworthy eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper as a sin PECULIARLY sinful ; still, I apprehend that we can make excel-

lent sense of his words without finding in them the Theory of the "Immediate" Real Presence of His body and blood in that ordinance.

The occasion, on which he wrote is well known. The grossly "carnal" Corinthians had fallen not only into contentions and divisions, but also into the practice of making the Lord's Supper a common meal, or, something worse, an occasion of excessive sensual indulgence. They paid no attention to it as a divinely ordained Memorial of the death and passion of the Lord Jesus. They "discerned" not between this and an ordinary feast; they ate, drank and were drunken. They "discerned not the Lord's body," in that they treated the sacred Memorial of it as a profane festival. They had lost sight of the true character and design of the Sacrament, and had gone to such "excess of rioting" that, as a special judgment, some of them were seized with "weakness and sickness," while "many of them were fallen "asleep," either in literal death, or in awful insensibility. They thus realized, in their own sad experience, that, to "eat and drink unworthily," was, of a truth, "to eat and drink judgment to themselves." They were "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," they "crucified the Son of God afresh," in that they heaped abuse on that sacred ordinance, in which He was represented. Contempt of the Symbol is

contempt of the thing symbolized. Contempt of the representative is contempt of the Being represented. Thus the BODY OF CHRIST was dishonored by the abuse heaped on its MEMORIAL. Thus, "The KING OF SAINTS" Himself was insulted by the slight cast on His divinely constituted REPRESENTATIVE.

This plainly is the whole of the Apostle's meaning. There is no need of searching for what cannot be found, the alleged "immediate" and Real Presence of His Body in order to justify the strong language in which he denounced judgment on the sin of the sensual Corinthians.

2. But, though the view, which has now been taken, give us the first and most obvious feature of this Sacrament, yet there is a second, and perhaps a more important feature of the Rite ; and to this I now proceed to call your earnest attention. I know not how to express it better than by saying that, as the Lord's Supper is Love's Memorial of the bodily absent Saviour, so also it is FAITH'S MIRROR of the Sacrifice on the Cross.

The Theory of the Real Presence admits that the Lord's Supper is a Memorial of the death of Christ. So far, indeed, as this Theory is embraced by a member of our Church, it cannot do otherwise than make the admission. The formularies of our Church, in accord with the words of Christ, are too full of this Memorial feature of the Rite to allow of

its being denied, or even left without mention. Yet, the advocates of the Theory do little more, in their writings, than to recognize the existence of this feature. So far as I have studied them, they dwell not on it; they seem not to consider it of much importance; they repeatedly warn us against making this feature prominent; they lay their main stress on the point of the alleged Real Presence, as though it alone were worthy of much consideration; as though it alone involved the whole vital essence of the Sacrament; and as though, if it were a Memorial merely, it would be an empty thing. They consider the consecrated elements, if signs, yet such signs as have, joined with them, the thing signified, the very body and blood of Christ really present in the Sacrament, and actually conveyed by the hands of the Priest together with their significant emblems; such signs as derive their whole importance from the fact that they are real **VEHICLES** of the mightiest mystery beneath the sun.

I am ready to admit that, if we were to limit this ordinance to the character of "a mere sign," though we should still retain somewhat of inestimable value, yet we should be robbing "this Holy mystery" of a part of its fullness and richness. Nevertheless, we may reject the dogma of the alleged Real Presence, and yet retain all "the marrow and fatness" of the Rite, which can be drawn

from the words of Christ at the time of its institution, or from the language of His apostles at any other time. The feature, which I have just mentioned, in calling the Lord's Supper FAITH'S MIRROR of the Sacrifice on the Cross, is one of the most important of its Scriptural characteristics. In His instituting words, it is true that Christ says nothing of FAITH in His Sacrifice on the Cross, though He does speak explicitly of our eating bread and drinking wine in MEMORY of Him. Nevertheless, His instituting words necessarily imply that we are to exercise faith in Him as such a Sacrifice ; inasmuch as we know, from other language of His, that by faith alone can we receive that " remission of sins," for procuring which His " blood was shed." Besides, from the instituting words themselves, we learn that the Cup in His sacred Feast represents " the New Covenant in His Blood." In this New Covenant, which is nothing else than that provision of grace, under which the Church of the old Dispensation, as well as that of the New, was placed, the Sacrifice on the Cross was promised, prefigured and virtually given, as " the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." And this was a Covenant, which, while it contained, on the part of God, the promise of a Saviour, as the true Sacrifice, required, on the part of man, FAITH in that promise, and consequently in that work of atone-

ment by Sacrifice, which the promise guaranteed. FAITH, then, is that act by which we originally become parties to this new and gracious covenant of life. There may be significant rites, in which this faith is to be SPECIALLY exercised ; still, faith must be antecedent to any such rite ; else the rite itself will be an empty and a useless form ; for, "without faith it is impossible to please God" in anything ; much more in so serious a thing as a religious ordinance.

Let us look, then, more directly at the point before us. In the Lord's Supper, the Cup "represents the blood," which the Covenant of grace guaranteed should be shed, and which consequently has been "shed for the remission of sins ;" and, as one of the seals of that Covenant, this Sacrament is now Christ's visible "PLEDGE," that the promise is and shall be fulfilled to every one that BELIEVETH on Him as the Son of God, the only Saviour of sinners. In view of this "Pledge," Faith REALIZES, with peculiar vividness, the fulfillment of the promise ; and thus, the Lord's Supper becomes, to the true Christian communicant, FAITH'S MIRROR of the Sacrifice on the Cross. In that mirror, held as it were by the hand of the Divine Surety, faith sees reflected Christ's blood-shedding for the remission of sins ; and, as faith is the act, by which we originally become parties to the gracious Covenant

of Salvation, so, whenever faith is subsequently exercised in view of this "SEAL" of the Covenant, this "PLEDGE" of Salvation, this MIRROR of the Cross, there is a repeated renewal of our personal act of covenanting. We then and there give ourselves anew to Christ, as His redeemed, while He assures us anew of the truth that He is our Redeemer ; or enables us to realize, with fresh comfort, the certainty of the assurance that, "in Him, we have redemption through His blood,—the forgiveness of sin." He does not "convey" this forgiveness through any "Sacrifice" then offered ; for this forgiveness we have when first, in the faith of a true Christian, we give ourselves to Him, and receive Him as our Saviour ; but He then assures us anew of our forgiveness, quickens our faith afresh in His assurance, pours into our hearts the fuller comforts of our relation to Him, and thus makes our whole inner man stronger for all that remains of our walk, and work, and warfare in His service. Every time when we go to the Communion in the exercise of a true faith, we thus renew our Covenant with God in Christ Jesus ; and the effect is, that our souls gather this rich and divine refreshment, while faith sees, in that sacred Mirror, the visible "seal" of the Promise, the ordained "Pledge" of an infallibly certain salvation to every true believer in Christ.

This, as we may safely understand it, is the faith, by which, in the language of our Catechism, "the Body and Blood of Christ are SPIRITUALLY taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper ;" by those, who have the faith of the true Christian. Thus faith feeds upon Christ, so that His "flesh becomes meat indeed, and His blood, drink indeed ;"—"the Bread of God,"—"the Bread of Life ;"—the living Bread which came down from heaven," that, "if any man eat of this Bread, he may live forever ;" and it is all through FAITH ;—faith that makes Christ this living Bread at ALL times, and only with a more quickening and a more satisfying nourishment at the sacramental Table.

Our Cathecism teaches that, in a Sacrament are two parts, "the outward, visible sign ; and the inward, spiritual grace ;" and that, in "the Lord's Supper, the outward part, or sign, consists in "the bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received ;" while "the inward part, or thing signified," is, "the body and blood of Christ, which are SPIRITUALLY taken and received by the faithful in that Supper." Between this, as I have just explained it, and that view of the Sacrament, which includes the notion of a Real Presence, there is an essential and vitally important difference. The Theory of the Real Presence makes the body and

blood of Christ, as the things signified, actually IN the Sacrament, and really "conveyed" through, or with, the signs. The Catechism teaches no such doctrine, but is perfectly consistent with the explanation, that the thing signified, the real Body of Christ, is ABSENT, and not conveyed through, or with the sign, being only SPIRITUALLY taken and received by the faithful; that is, by "FAITH." The Theory of the Real Presence teaches that the body and blood of Christ cannot be "spiritually taken and received," unless actually IN the Sacrament, and "conveyed" through, or WITH, the sign. The Catechism is consistent with the doctrine that this body and blood may be "spiritually taken and received," though ABSENT and NOT conveyed through, or with, the sign. The former teaches that the THING SIGNIFIED is present on the ALTAR "independently of faith;" the latter teaches that the SIGN ONLY is present on the TABLE, while the Thing Signified is absent at the right hand of God, and present to FAITH ONLY, as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

The Catechism, then, teaches not the doctrine of the Real Presence; nor am I aware that the term, "Real Presence," is ever used in the accredited Standards of our Church. There is, indeed, a sense, in which the true Christian receives the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper as he receives

them at no other time and in no other way; and this sense I have already explained. Inasmuch, however, as there are certain expressions in our Communion Service, upon which I have as yet offered no special remark, I will here cite them for the purpose of stating more definitely the sense to which I refer, and which I conceive these expressions to embody.

In that Service, God is said to have "given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament;" so that, therein, we "come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food." We therefore utter the petition: "Grant us . . . gracious ^{Lord} God, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood; and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." To the same effect are the following words: "We most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of Thy Almighty Goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy Word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine; that we, receiving them, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most

blessed body and blood." The following words also express the same meaning : " Humbly beseeching Thee that we, and all others, who shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ ; be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one Body with Him, that He may dwell in them and they in Him." And, finally, having uttered such petitions, and finished our act of communion, we express our sense of the benefit received in the following terms, which carry the same sense : " We most heartily thank Thee for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have received these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ ; and dost assure us thereby of Thy favor and goodness towards us ; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical Body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

The first remark to be offered upon all these passages, is this : that, as already observed in passing, so far as they touch the point now before us, they all carry, in varying forms, ONE and the SAME meaning. If, therefore, this meaning can once be ascertained, it will open all the forms, in which it is here inclosed. What, then, is this meaning ?

The advocates of the Theory, which I am opposing, find the meaning of all this language in our Communion Service in their doctrine of the Real Presence, according to which the very flesh and blood of Christ are given and received at the same time and together with their signs ; so that thus we spiritually, though none the less really, eat that flesh and drink that blood ; in consequence of which we become, in a great mystery, one flesh and one blood with Christ, He dwelling in us and we in Him, “commingled and co-united,” each with the other, by the communication of the Divine nature. They would say that though the term, Real Presence, is not used, yet the truth of the Real Presence is implied ; and that it is the only one, which can open the meaning of those expressions, within the varying forms of which it is in-folded. But, that the notion, as well as the term of the Real Presence, in any sense, which would satisfy these Theorists, is absent from those expressions, must, I apprehend, be evident to any one, who will give them a candid and careful thought.

I have already remarked that those expressions, so far as the present point is concerned, all carry one and the same meaning. In the next place, then, if in those expressions the truth of the Real Presence be implied, why do we pray that God would “vouchsafe to bless and sanctify His crea-

tures of Bread and Wine with His Word and Holy Spirit?" Why do we not rather pray that He would bless and sanctify them by uniting with them the present body and blood of his dear Son, that thus we may receive the benefit of His repeated Sacrifice for our sins? Or, again; why do we pray for grace "so to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body and our souls washed by His most precious blood?" Why do we not rather pray that we may so eat and drink as that each of us may become one body, one flesh and blood, with Him, commingled and co-united with Him by the communication of His divine nature, the conveyance to us of His incarnate substance? The truth is, that to be "clean," to be "washed," are well-known Biblical forms of speech, implying to be "pardoned," to be "purified" from all sin, and thus, at last, to be perfected, and made glorious in all holiness both of body and of soul. That this is the real result, which is at all times sought and realized by faith in Christ, as our atoning Sacrifice, though more largely realized in the Lord's Supper than at other times, by reason of the greater vividness with which faith sees Him through this Divine Symbol, is evident from the fact, that, when our Church, in her Communion Service, drops her symbolic language, and speaks

out in literal terms, she expresses no other than this very result of "pardon" and "purification" from sin, with perfect holiness and glory, as making up the "other benefits of Christ's passion." Hence, immediately after one of the petitions, which I have cited, praying that we "may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood," she adds: "We earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that, by the merits and death of thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion." Here, the symbolic dress of language is dropped away from the body of literal sense, which it had inwrapped, and leaves that sense exposed in clear view. "By the merits and death of Christ, and through faith in His blood," the very moment we first exercise this faith, we "obtain remission of our sins," and at least begin to realize "all other benefits of His passion" in the growing holiness and glory of our Christian character and lives. But, in the Lord's Supper, this important result within us is specially expedited. For here FAITH is specially vigorous and invigorated. Here, LOVE is specially fervent and overcoming; giving us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ, over sin

and the world, the flesh and the devil. And thus, even in uncommon measures, "all other benefits of Christ's passion" are insured in the ripening holiness and glory of our souls. This is the literal Sense of what our Church teaches in these parts of her Communion Service. Wrapped up again in her dress of symbol, it becomes "so eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ," that our sinful bodies are made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood." The symbolic and the literal in these two sets of passages embody not two distinct and different meanings, but one and the same meaning; and it is a meaning, which sets, as far off from this Sacrament as the poles of the heavens are asunder, the notion of the alleged Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ.

Those, who maintain this doctrine, will doubtless inquire: "Does not our Church, when she prays that we may "so eat the flesh and drink the blood" of Christ "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body and our souls washed through His most precious blood," immediately add the petition: "that we may evermore DWELL IN HIM and HE IN us?" And, does she not also, after praying, "that, by the merits and death of Christ, and through faith in His blood, we may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion," subjoin the

petition, "that we and all others, who shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Christ, be filled with grace and heavenly benediction, and made ONE BODY with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him?" Does not this mutual INDWELLING, this co-union of Christ and Christians into ONE BODY, imply the doctrine of the Real Presence, as the mystery, in which this divine incorporation is effected?'

To this questioning, after what has already been said of "the gift of the Spirit," and the consequent "indwelling of God" with His people, it is scarcely necessary to return a labored reply.—I will, however add: that, in what she here says, our Church cannot be considered as teaching, even by implication, the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the consequent commingling and co-uniting of the very Body and Blood of Christ with the body and soul of the communicant. To such a doctrine and its consequence her teaching is an utter stranger. The mutual indwelling of Christ and the Christian is not effected by an intermingling of their bodily substances. It is simply their Spiritual Fellowship. Besides, her language in these passages of her Communion Service refers, not so much to the individual union between Christ and the Christian, as to the corporate union between Christ and the

Church. This corporate union, indeed, involves that individual union. Still, it is to the general, rather than to the particular, that her language is here addressed. She is, as she says, "praying for the whole state of Christ's Church militant;" for the whole body of those who are, or "shall be, partakers of this holy communion;" who are, or shall be, joined in this Sacred Fellowship in memory of a bodily absent Saviour. She is praying that all these, as one grand whole, may be made "ONE BODY with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him;" that He may dwell in this great Body, this whole Fellowship, by dwelling with and among its members; and that this great Body, this whole Fellowship, may dwell in Him, by being united with Him as a whole, by the spirit of living dependence on Him and of loving obedience to Him as its DIVINE HEAD. She is teaching the old Bible doctrine, which she finds, as in other places, so especially in the twelfth Chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the second Chapter of that to the Colossians; the doctrine that the Church, as a whole, is "ONE BODY;" that of this Body Christ is the HEAD, while Christians are "members in particular;" and that there are benefits and a blessedness in "holding the Head," in being united in the spirit of living dependence on Him, and of loving obedience to Him, from whom alone "all the Body,

by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God ;” that is, with a very great and glorious increase. This is the doctrine which she is teaching in those expressions of her Communion Service ; the doctrine that the Church as a whole is Christ’s BODY, and that He is its HEAD ; His Body on earth, and its Head in heaven ; and that Head seated there supreme over all, ruling and defending all by His power, and feeding and “ filling all with grace and heavenly benediction.”

That this is her meaning she herself makes evident in another part of the language, which has been quoted. After having closed the solemn act of consecrating and setting apart the elements of the Sacrament, and of delivering them to the communicants, she offers her great thanksgiving for the benefits received, in that God hath vouchsafed to feed His true children “ with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of His Son,” and to “ assure them thereby of His favor and goodness towards them,” and of their being “ very members incorporate in the mystical Body of His Son ;” and then, to show what she means by their being thus “ incorporate ” as very, or true, members in this “ mystical Body of Christ,” she immediately defines her terms by saying : “ which is the blessed company of all faithful people.” The

mystical Body of Christ, then, is the blessed company of all faithful people ; and the very members incorporate include all who are truly joined in the sacred Fellowship. Here is the outbreking of light over all her meaning in this and in all similar phraseology. It is not the very Body of Christ, which her communicants have individually received into their bodies,—Christ and the Christian “commingled and co-united” each with each, and thus forming, in every particular member, one body, one flesh and blood, with Him ; it is not this, which she shadows forth in her phraseology ;—but it is the Body corporate of the Church, “that holy Fellowship,” as she immediately calls it, that “blessed company of all faithful people ;” it is this, into which, by faith through the renewing of the Holy Ghost, the individual becomes incorporated, or made a “member in particular” of that “mystical Body,” the Church, of which Christ is the Head, and in our fellowship with which she prays that we may ever “continue,” “doing all such good works as God hath prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Here, as in the former specimens of her language, we see our Church dropping the dress of symbol from the body of literal signification, which it had inwrapped, and leaving that signification clearly exposed to view. “Very members incorporate in the mystical Body

of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people ;” “the Communion,” “the Fellowship,” into which we are brought by the renewing work of the Spirit, unto faith in Christ, and in which we are nourished and strengthened by feeding spiritually with the mouth of that same faith upon the Body and Blood of Christ, as symbolized to us in His holy Supper ;—THIS is what our Church means when she speaks of our “so eating the flesh and drinking the blood of God’s dear Son, that we may evermore DWELL IN Him and He in us ;” and that “all, who are partakers of this holy communion, may be made ONE BODY with Him.” These two modes of expression do not embody two distinct and different meanings. They embody one and the same meaning. Expressed in symbol, it is “so eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ that He dwelleth in us and we in Him,” so that, collectively, we are “made ONE BODY with Him,” His great “mystical Body.” Dropping the dress of symbol, and expressed in literal phrase, it is so “eating the bread which is broken” and so “drinking the cup which is blessed,”—that is, doing both with such a living faith in Christ,—that we become ONE CHURCH with Him, under His supreme government and effective influence ; one Communion and Fellowship ; “the blessed company of all faithful people ;” “knit to-

gether in love," and by faith "holding the Head" from whom, by these "joints and bands," "nourishment is ministered," and the great company "increaseth with the increase of God." This, I repeat, is the true meaning of our Church in all this phraseology; and it is a meaning, which puts utterly away the doctrine of the Real Presence, as this doctrine is now understood. Our Church, in her Communion Service, repeatedly carries Sacramental symbol and literal sense side by side; now wrapping up her meaning in the striking and beautiful dress of the one, and now unfolding it in the plain and reasonable language of the other; and in both, following the example of Christ her Head, in such a way, that, to a docile disciple, taught of the Spirit, or even willing to be taught, each explains each, and both make one divine whole of rich and powerful significancy.

And now, in order that we may see more distinctly the important difference between the two Theories, which have been presented, I will draw out the two points, which each Theory includes, so far as they have just been the subjects of examination.

The Theory, then, which involves the doctrine of the Real Presence, puts a Sacrifice into the Lord's Supper, and by virtue of that Sacrifice, through the hands of its priestly offerer, "conveys" remission of sin. But the Theory, which rejects

the doctrine of the Real Presence, makes the Lord's Supper, the "Memorial" of a Sacrifice, and a "Seal" of the Covenant, which "promises" remission of sin to every one that believeth in Christ, even upon the first exercise of such a living faith. This the first point of difference ; and it is of immeasurable importance.

Again : the Theory, which involves the doctrine of the Real Presence, brings the **VERY BODY** of Christ into the Sacrament ;—calling it, indeed, an invisible and spiritual body, and yet claiming that it is the very body that suffered on the Cross ; and it teaches that this Body, thus present, is actually "conveyed, by the hands of the priest, at the same time and together with the sign, into the body and soul of the recipient, "commingled and co-united with both," so that each communicant becomes one body, one flesh and blood, with Christ. But the Theory, which rejects this doctrine, considers the Lord's Supper as a **SYMBOL** of the Body of Christ ; a Rite, which brings all, who worthily receive it, into one Communion and Fellowship ; the one "blessed Company of all faithful people ;" the one "mystical Body" of Christ, which is His Church ; under Him as "the Head," and receiving governance, grace and heavenly benediction from Him, as the source of all authority, life and blessedness. This is the second point of difference ; and it is, if

comparison may be indulged between things immeasurable, of still greater importance than the other.

The evils, which, in the movement of ages, flow from the doctrine of the Real Presence, I have already sketched at some length. In this place, therefore, I need not repeat the sketch. It will be enough to say that we have the seeds of those evils planted in our portion of the vineyard; and that, just so far and just so fast as these seeds are permitted to have nurture and growth, their baleful fruits will inevitably become visible in darkening the minds, confusing the Theology, and corrupting both the faith and the practice of our Church.

I have said that there is a sense, in which the true Christian receives the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper as he receives them at no other time and in no other way. The examination, which has now been made, of the language of our Communion Service, will enable me to state, more definitely, what I mean by the saying.—I mean, then, that while the true Christian may and does receive the Body and Blood of Christ, when, alone in the privacy of his closet, and in the secrecy of his heart, he believes in his Saviour, and relies on His atoning Sacrifice alone for pardon, justification, and eternal life; and when, thus alone,

he rejoices in the blessed privilege, which is his, of being a child of God ; he yet receives this Body and Blood with a still richer fullness of benefit when, in the company of the faithful, in the House of God, and at the Table of his Lord, his faith sees that same atoning Sacrifice on the Cross reflected, with unwonted vividness, in that Divinely appointed MIRROR, which the hand of his Surety holds before him ; when his faith, thus social in its exercise, looks on the visible " Pledge " of his Saviour's love for his soul, and on the visible " Seal " of the promise, which guarantees the free and full forgiveness of all his sins ; and when, with his faith thus awakened and strengthened, and his love, as the fruit of faith, made proportionally glowing and intense, he identifies himself, or rather realizes his identity, with " the Communion of Saints," the Fellowship of the faithful, and stands in that very company, and in the midst of those very solemnities, which Christ most delights to honor and to bless ; which are, in themselves, best calculated to bring into one living assemblage round his reverent yet rejoicing soul all that is most affecting and most quickening, most comforting and most hallowing in the wonders of Bethlehem and of Gethsemane, of the Cross and of the grave, of the Resurrection and of Heaven ; and which are, therefore, to be regarded as those occasions of special and of sacred privilege,

whereat Christ vouchsafes, in all its richness, the secret of His favor and loving-kindness to His chosen ; and whereon He sheds, in all their fullness, the blessings of His grace and heavenly benediction, even from out that heaven of life and that throne of glory, unto which He is now exalted. This is the peculiarity, under which faith exercises itself at the Lord's Supper : and this is what I mean by saying, that the true Christian then receives the Body and Blood of Christ as he receives them at no other time and in no other way. The act of his faith is the same, at all times and places ; but, then only is it that he receives Christ,—not simply by faith in the Sacrifice, which is represented, and which was, once for all, offered on the Cross,—but also in sight of the very MIRROR, which reflects that Sacrifice on his Spiritual sense ; in sight of the very PLEDGE, which certifies him of the never-dying love of Christ ; and in sight of the very SEAL, which assures him that he is a ransomed, forgiven and adopted child of God. And this, I humbly conceive, is the only sense, in which the Christian can, with truth, be said to receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. He receives them by looking, from the beating heart of LOVE, and with the kindling eye of FAITH, through the MEMORIAL to Him, whom it keeps in memory ; from the MIRROR, to Him whose bleeding face shineth

therein ; through the **SYMBOL**, to the Sacrifice, which it represents ; and through the **SEAL**, to the Pardon, which, on the terms of the Covenant, it insures. To suppose that we receive the very Body and Blood of Christ into our bodies and souls, or that we feed on them in the Lord's Supper in any other sense than that of believing in Christ, relying on His atoning Sacrifice alone, and being spiritually strengthened and refreshed amid the privileges and under the blessings, which are vouchsafed from heaven on that precious ordinance ; is to suppose that, for which we have no evidence either in our Liturgy or in the Bible, and which is at war both with experience and with exegesis. Neither reason nor revelation shows any other way of "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man," than that now indicated. This way both reason and revelation concur in showing, and it is the way of Life. To seek any other is to plunge into deep peril amid those darkling mists of error, which are spread over the entrance to the Way of Death.

3. Having dwelt thus at length on the two most important features of the Lord's Supper, I proceed now to notice a third, to which, also, great importance is usually attached. I refer to that, which presents the Ordinance to our regards as a **MEANS OF GRACE**. This, however, is not so much a distinct

feature of the Ordinance itself, as it is a contingency, which depends, for its realization, on a right use of the Ordinance, as Love's Memorial of the bodily absent Jesus, and as Faith's Mirror of the Sacrifice on the Cross.

In the first place, let us distinguish carefully between this Sacrament as a MEANS of grace, and the same as a "SOURCE" of grace. It will be remembered that, at the opening of this treatise, I referred to the notion, which is gaining currency among us, that "the Sacraments are SOURCES of divine grace." Now, this is either a very unguarded expression, or the designed enunciation of a doctrine full of error. A SOURCE is a Fountain, first cause, original producer. A MEANS is an Instrument, used by an agent in the production of an intended effect ; or a medium through which some effect, or supply, is communicated from such an agent. To say, therefore, without explanation, that "the Sacraments are SOURCES of divine grace," is, either unguardedly, or designedly, to lead men to stop at the Sacraments ; to regard them as things endued with a spontaneously miraculous energy ; and to rest in them as, by a secret power of their own, in some mysterious way, of which we are to know nothing as to either its operation or its effect, making us partakers of the Christian character and of the divine life. The Sacraments are not SOURCES

of grace : they are but MEANS of grace. And even when we come to regard them as means, it is necessary rightly to understand and carefully to consider the sense in which they are means. They are not means in such a sense, as that, by them, God first generates the divine life in the soul ; but only in such a sense as that, through them, God nourishes a divine life previously generated. Nor are they means, even in such a sense as that, through them, God nourishes the already generated divine life of the soul by any virtue lodged in the substance of the Sacraments themselves ; but only in such a sense as that, through the vital truths and realities, which they affectingly symbolize and represent, the blessing of God perfects the life, which Himself has previously produced by the agency of His own quickening Spirit and by the instrumentality of His sanctifying Word. This is what I mean when I speak of the Lord's Supper as a MEANS OF GRACE. It is a medium, through which the Holy Spirit nourishes all the previously existing graces of our Christian character by the special energy, with which, in the Symbols of this Sacrament, He presents and applies to our souls those vital truths and realities, which cluster so movingly around the Cross of Christ.

Our Church Catechism expresses this meaning briefly but well, when it says that " the benefits,

whereof we are partakers " in this Sacrament, consist in "the strengthening and refreshing of our SOULS by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our BODIES are by the Bread and Wine." That is ;— as our natural bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the natural Bread and Wine, which are received into them and digested by them, so are our souls "strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." How this "strengthening and refreshing of our souls" in the Lord's Supper, come from "the Body and Blood of Christ," we have already seen. The human body has its own way of receiving and digesting its proper sustenance. The Soul also has hers : and it is as peculiar to her as a living Spirit, as that of the body is to itself as mere organized matter. The Soul receives and digests her proper sustenance by the inner mouth of her understanding, and the inner organs of her faith and love. By her understanding she apprehends the divine truths and realities of the Body and Blood of Christ ; by her faith she receives and appropriates them ; and by her love she tastes the divine sweetness of such heavenly food. Faith, especially, is that "spiritual faculty" of hers, which, for the purposes designed, "annihilates both time and space," by taking her, in its quick motion, to the Cross on Calvary, or to the

Throne in Heaven," and there feeding her ravished vision with a sight of Him, who once bled for her sins and now reigns to her salvation.

Before proceeding, I pause another moment upon the difference between this teaching and that of the Theory of the Real Presence. The authors, so often referred to, speak of our receiving the very Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper into our BODIES as well as into our souls, "commingling and co-uniting with them and preserving both for incorruption." How utterly different is this from the teaching of our Catechism! In defining "the benefits" of the Lord's Supper, the Catechism says they consist in "strengthening and refreshing our SOULS by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our BODIES are by the Bread and Wine." Here is nothing about the very Body and Blood of Christ being received into our SOULS, commingling and co-uniting with them, and thus preserving them unto incorruption. It merely speaks of "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ;" "spiritually taken and received by faith." FAITH receives them, and thereby the soul is strengthened and refreshed. Much less is anything here said about the very flesh and blood of Christ being received into our BODIES, commingling and co-uniting with them, and "preserving them for incorruption" by imbuing them with "the prin-

ciple of immortality." To this conceit our Catechism is an utter stranger. It is but a part of the general figment of the Theory of the Real Presence. The Catechism, like the Bible, leaves our bodies, notwithstanding all the sacraments, which they may have received, heirs to their natural corruption, to be raised, at the last day, and made co-inheritors of life with our souls,—not by any "principle of Immortality," which they had received and carried with them from the Sacrament into the grave, but—by the Almighty power of God on that morning of eternal wonders. I resume, now, the consideration of the Lord's Supper as a MEANS OF GRACE.

The Spiritual benefits, then, of this Sacrament come through faith in Christ Crucified, in that atoning Sacrifice, in which His Body and Blood were offered up to God on the Cross ; and through the blessing, which the Holy Spirit sheds on those peculiar helps, under which faith then looks upon that Sacrifice. When promising to His disciples the Comforter, who should be with them during His bodily absence from the world, Christ uses these important words : " He shall glorify Me ; for He shall receive of mine and show it unto you." John xvi : 14. In the exercise of His divine function, then, the Comforter takes this Memorial, as *one* of the things of Christ, and "shows" it to the Christian's mind. He shows how it represents the

death of Christ for the sins of men. He makes plain, through its symbol, the precious truth and efficacy of the Atonement. And thus, He "glorifies" Christ in the Sacrament which Christ hath ordained. Through His blessing, the emblems in the Sacrament become, not only significant, but, to the believer, affectingly and sanctifyingly significant. The divine truths and realities, which they represent, find the Christian's heart, through His gracious influences, specially prepared for the touching and moving contemplation of those truths and realities. And thus, while, by faith, his devout soul regards the whole sacred Memorial before him, his love,—as well as his faith,—his humility and his hope, his courage and his zeal, his apprehension of divine things and his relish for divine fellowship, his deadness to the world and his longings after Heaven, are mightily quickened, and his whole "inner man" powerfully "strengthened and refreshed" by his view of the Body and Blood of Christ, and of that great work of Redemption, in which they were offered a Sacrifice. Hence, we see that the Lord's Supper becomes a means of grace on the same principle, with that, on which preaching, or the reading of the Word, becomes a means of grace ; that is, through the blessing of the Holy Spirit in the exercise of faith. This Divine Agent acts—not through the substance of the Bread

and Wine, but—through the truths and realities, which they so affectingly symbolize. Those sacred Symbols are designed to aid the Christian, through the influences of the Holy Spirit, more touchingly and movingly to realize and receive the whole body of truths concerning the death and Sacrifice of Christ for his sins.

The great difference between this Sacrament and preaching as a means of grace consists in this : that the Sacrament takes up mainly those truths which respect the work of Christ upon the Cross ; and these truths it presents, under the blessing of the Holy Spirit, with unwonted vividness and effect to the specially prepared minds of Christian Communicants only ; while preaching is designed to take up all the truths of Revelation, and to present them all, under the blessing of the same Spirit, to all classes of hearers and under all circumstances of life ; for their conversion as well as for their sanctification ; for their direction in all duty and for their support under all trials ; for their light in all darkness and for their comfort in all sorrows. But, whether in the Sacrament or in preaching, the Holy Spirit reaches the soul in the same way, through the truth, which He presents, and not through the material elements in the Sacrament, or through the physical man in preaching. To suppose the Body and Blood of Christ really present

in the Sacrament, and really conveyed with the elements, does not, as it is urged, make the ordinance fuller, more significant, or more efficacious. It does but burden its simplicity, darken its meaning, and, in the end, pervert its operation. Keep the ordinance pure, simple, Scriptural, and Christ, by His Spirit, will fill it with something more divine than His mere flesh and blood,—with the power of His quickening, purifying Spirit, and of His strengthening and refreshing truth ; with deep and soul-cheering views of His Cross ; and with clear and enrapturing visions into Heaven. He will fill it with His DIVINE PRESENCE, as the heart-comforting, heart-sanctifying God. He will fill it with full and satisfying foretastes of that eternal life, which He came to purchase and to insure for every humble and obedient believer in His name.

It is really astonishing that the writers of the school, to which I have so often referred, should be so ready as they are to admit the superior fullness of the privileges, which Rome retains and enjoys in this Sacrament ; and to mourn over the meagre portion, which we and those of the Anglican Church, who agree with us, have gathered and brought with us in our unhappy act of separating from that more favored Communion. All that Rome retains, over and above those Scriptural views of the Sacrament, which I have exhibited,

may be regarded as darkness, putting out the light of truth ; and corruption, bringing a perilous superstition in the place of a " reasonable service."

Upon the remaining views of the Lord's Supper I shall touch more briefly, both because they involve no disputed points, and because, being common to both the Sacraments, some of them have already been exhibited under the head of Baptism.

4. In the fourth place, then, the Lord's Supper is a Divinely ordained TEST of men's obedience to Christ.

"This do in remembrance of Me." Such is Christ's Command ; and it is as obligatory upon those, to whom it is addressed, as any other precept in the Bible ; not, indeed, as founded on the same reasons, but as resting on the same authority. Other commands bind to instant obedience, without any previous, or preparatory process. Such are the commands to "love God supremely and our neighbor as ourselves ;" and to have "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." But this binds to obedience as the result of a previous preparatory process. In other words : Christ does not command us to "remember" Him in this Sacrament BEFORE we have "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ ;" but, being always under obligation to repent and believe, He requires us, AFTER we have become really pen-

itent believers, immediately to express our allegiance to Him in this high, symbolic act. Inasmuch, however, as all are under obligation to repent of sin and to believe in the Saviour; there is this sense, in which all are under obligation to remember Christ in His holy Supper. He claims obedience, as well as faith and love; and this ordinance is a **TEST** of our obedience, as well as a Symbol to our faith and love. If men have the temper of obedience to Christ,—that perhaps best proof of love for Him, and best fruit of faith in Him,—they will approach the sacred feast, and thus manifest that temper before the world. On the contrary, if they have it not, or if shame, or the fear of man, or the love of the world come into conflict with the awakened spirit of reverence for their Saviour's behest, and finally overmaster a sentiment, which would otherwise have grown into a settled principle of obedience, they will refuse to approach the holy Supper, and thus manifest, before Heaven and earth, their disobedience to the Divine Saviour of men. Christ, indeed, needs not this **TEST** to show Him who are obedient and who are disobedient, seeing that, as "the Searcher of hearts," He "knoweth what is in man:" but He designs by this means to show us—the Church and the world—whether we cherish the one or the other of these tempers, and thus to make it evident to all, "what

manner of spirit we are of." He has left this ordinance in His Church as, on the whole, a visible "detector of the hearts" of men. He seeks by it to reveal them to themselves, as they stand revealed to Him; and thus to bring them, if possible, by repentance to God and by faith to the Cross.

5. Again, in the fifth place: The Lord's Supper is, together with Baptism, one of the prescribed **BADGES**, by which the disciples of Christ are distinguishable from the world, and made amenable to the needful law of discipline in the Church.

When once baptized, we can never become unbaptized; but, though once admitted to the Lord's Supper, we may yet be cut off from further fellowship in that Divine Symbol. Nor is such an excision a light thing. On the contrary, as to be worthily admitted to this Sacrament is the highest outward privilege, which we can enjoy on earth, so to be deservedly cut off from it is the highest of earthly deprivations. By our admission to this privilege, we have applied to us the highest visible Seal of the truth of Christ's "exceeding great and precious promise" of pardon and life: by our excision from it—if for good cause—we are declared unfit, not only for the Seal itself, but also for the mercy, which, to the true Christian, it guarantees. By the one, we are brought into the highest company, that of Christ's spiritual followers;—by the

other, we are shut out amid the society of all the servants of sin and the world. By the former, we are encircled, in all their plenitude and perfection, with the whole system of outward means, which God hath so graciously and so wisely devised for strengthening and embellishing our Christian characters in all the graces and beauties of the heavenly life ; and by the latter, we are placed without this circle of blessings, and separated from the action of those influences, with which that circle is filled ; and, in this condition, are once more left, with the choice of life and death still before us indeed, but exposed, in making that choice, to all the subtle enmities, and sturdy oppositions, and to all the perilous crafts, and counteracting subtleties, of the world, the flesh and the devil.

This view of the Lord's Supper, as one of the visible **BADGES** of Christ's disciples, is very important. Without such a badge, the Church would be deprived of her most effective means of discipline, and exposed, without the possibility of purification, to even deeper corruptions than have yet defiled her. It is true, that this means of discipline, like all other good things, has been abused. In those ages, when spiritual despotism ruled without restraint, even kings and their kingdoms have been made to tremble and bow down before the awful terrors of the Church's "Interdict." But,

those ages are past. The rod of terror, which abuse of power had put into the hands of spiritual tyrants, has been broken ; and, so far at least as we are concerned, has left, in its stead, nothing but the emblem of holy authority, placed in the hand of a spiritual parent, to be used for the benefit only of even her unworthy children. In this character it were devoutly to be wished, that it were more frequently, as it might then be more salutarily used. Among us, plainly, Discipline is in a state of decay ; and our Church harbors in her bosom many, who, both for her benefit and for their own, should be separated from her sacred Fellowship, and received no more to her holy Feast, until they can come back, robed in the white garments of most humble penitence, and shining in the evident graces of a heart-purifying faith.

6. And finally, in the sixth place, the Lord's Supper, in common also with Baptism, carries with it the evidence of a MORAL MONUMENT to the Truth and Divine Origin of Christianity, and to the identity of the Church through all ages.

To this point, however, already sufficiently illustrated under the head of Baptism, I merely recur, in this place, for the purpose of noticing the connection of this evidence with the Lord's Supper, and of saying once more, that this evidence is of great value. This Sacrament, as a simple Memo-

rial of the death of Christ, is one of the links in that infrangible chain of proofs, which binds the Church and the Christianity of our day to the Christianity and the Church of Apostolic times. Every time we go to the Lord's Table, we do, in effect, make a spiritual pilgrimage across the wide desert of The Ages ; a pilgrimage, which ends in bringing us out upon that holy ground, whereon "the Son of man" was crucified for our sins; and which leaves us kneeling there, where millions before us have knelt, with adoring hearts, around that imperishable Monument, erected on the triple plinth of the FACT, the DATE, and the MEANING of Christ's atoning Sacrifice.

7. And now, it only remains to add, that the foregoing views of the Sacrament of the Death of Christ are in sufficiently full accord with the teachings of our ARTICLES on this subject.

Thus, Article XXVIII. declares : The Supper of the Lord is not only a Sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another, but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death ; insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with FAITH, receive the same, the bread, which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Christ ; and likewise the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." . . . "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the

Supper only after a heavenly and Spiritual manner. And the mean, whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is FAITH.

Again ; Article XXV. says : " Sacraments, ordained of Christ, be not only BADGES, or TOKENS of Christian men's profession ; but rather, they be certain sure WITNESS and effectual SIGNS of grace and God's good-will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

After what has been said, it will not be necessary to dwell long on these definitions from our Articles. It will be sufficient to say : that the character of the Lord's Supper, as LOVE'S MEMORIAL of the bodily absent Jesus, is implied in the words, " Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death," and " Sign of Grace and God's good-will towards us : " that its character, as FAITH'S MIRROR of the Sacrifice on the Cross, is distinctly indicated in the phrase, " inasmuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with FAITH, receive the same, the Bread, which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ ; and, likewise, the Cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ ; " that its character, as a MEANS OF GRACE, is fully asserted in the expression ; " Effectual signs of grace and God's good-will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and

doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him :” that its character, as a **TEST** of our obedience to Christ, and also as a **BADGE** of discipleship under Him, is intimated in the single phrase, “Badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession :” and finally, that its character, as embodying the evidence of a **MORAL MONUMENT** to the truth and divine origin of Christianity and the Church, is set forth in the terms, “certain sure Witnesses . . of grace and God’s good-will towards us.” Moreover, from the whole of the language of these Articles, the doctrine of the Real Presence is excluded, not only by the omission of the **TERMS**, but also by the introduction of a clause, evidently designed to guard against the **NOTION** itself. “The Body of Christ,” says the Article, “is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner : and the **MEAN**, whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is **FAITH**.” ‘True,’ says the Theory : ‘but yet, the Body of Christ is present **INDEPENDENTLY** of Faith ; it is conveyed by the **HANDS** of the Priest ; and it is received into the **BODY**, as well as into the soul, of the communicant.’ This is quite another doctrine, a pure super-addition to that of the Article. According to the Article, **FAITH** takes the soul away from the Memorial and the Symbol, to the Cross and the Crucified, or to the Crown and the

Glorified ; and there, through its rapturous vision, feeds her on the merits, the benefits, the life, of our great Sacrifice ; of Him who "liveth and was dead, and behold, He is alive for evermore." Thus, "in a heavenly and spiritual manner," through "the MEAN of Faith," do we eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ ; and thus do the breaking of the Bread, and the blessing of the Cup prove, to the "worthy" recipient, "effectual signs of grace and God's good-will toward us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken"—where it already exists, "but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

CONCLUSION.

When treating of Baptism, I remarked, that we may reject the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, as we have seen it set forth ; and yet leave that ordinance all that Christ intended it should be. I trust, it has now been shown that we may, in like manner, reject the connected Theory of the Real Presence, as we have seen it exhibited ; and yet leave the Lord's Supper all that Christ, by His instituting words, designed to make it. At least, after such a rejection, this ordinance is left invested with all the attributes that I can discover for it, whether in the Bible, or in the Standards of our Church : and I know not that I can close the whole

examination better than by adapting to this part of the subject some of the language, with which I closed the views taken of Baptism.

In what I have said, then, of the Lord's Supper, I have shown that 'the view, which I have taken of this Ordinance, is all that the Bible and our Church in her chief standards of doctrine make it ; and that, therefore, the Bible and our standards being guides, we may reject the doctrine of the Real Presence, as it has been drawn from the writings of its advocates, without leaving this high Christian Ordinance stripped of its solemnity and importance, a mere soulless, lifeless FORM of what Christ intended should be instinct with mysterious and awful power. In fact, the view, which has now been taken of this ordinance, while it is Scriptural and simple, is for that very reason essential to its true beauty, value and efficacy. To burden it with the thick covering of the Theory of the Real Presence, how reverend and awful so ever the robes, in which it is thus designed to dress it, is but to disfigure its divine beauty, simplicity and life with what, in fact, robs it of much, if not all, of the salutary power, which it was designed to exert. Disencumbered and left, as Christ left it, and as our Church finds it, in the Bible, the Lord's Supper commends itself to the Christian's highest esteem, and to his most reverential affection, as every way

worthy of its Divine Institutor, and of the divine end, which in its institution He contemplated.' I add ; it is not because I wish to take from it the smallest portion of its true value, or to lessen in the smallest degree the reverence, which the most devout Christian should feel for it, as " the Sacrament of his Redemption by the death of Christ," that I have so earnestly urged the views presented in this treatise. I would as soon seek to put Christ out of His own Gospel, as I would to put His intention out of His own Ordinance. I have been thus urgent because I wish to separate from our apprehensions of this Ordinance a theory, which I am most thoroughly persuaded does not belong to it, and which I am as thoroughly persuaded can never be supposed to belong to it, without exposing the Church to the gradual but certain introduction of corruptions the most dangerous and of superstitions the most pernicious. It does seem to me that we must be blind to the teachings of all Church History for the last eighteen hundred years, before we can put out of sight the truth, that the two doctrines, which I have opposed, in the forms, under which I have opposed them,—Baptismal Regeneration and the Real Presence—have been copious spring-heads to some of the darkest streams of corruption, and to some of the deepest gulfs of superstition, under which the beautiful and simple forms

of Scriptural Christianity have ever been whelmed and buried.

The sum of the principles, illustrated in the present Treatise, is this : The sole end of God, in all His gracious dealings with us, is the renewal and sanctification of our sinful natures : the sole agent of this necessary change is the Holy Spirit : the sole Instrument, which the Holy Spirit uses in this work, is Divine Truth : while both Preaching and the Sacraments are but channels, of equally Divine appointment, through which, in their proper places, order and degree, that Spirit pours the energy of this Truth, in all its quickening, sanctifying and cheering light, upon waiting, inquiring, and obedient minds. The Theories, opposed to these principles, have also been examined by the light of the Bible and of our own Standards : but these principles lie at the base of the Treatise. Keep them in view, and make them practically influential, and the Church will be to us full of life ; and the way, along which she conducts us toward Heaven, will be luminous with safety : but lose sight of these principles, or suffer them to grow generally inoperative, and the Church herself is in danger of becoming but a body of death ; and the pathway, along which she leads us, will begin to be overhung with the darkness of error, superstition and fearful peril to the souls of men.

The Bible, as a Book of Divine Truths, has been given to be God's Instrument of purifying a "world lying in wickedness." In this, its purifying work, it has been cast, as a sacred leaven, into the great Lump, carrying with it, as forms, through which the Spirit ordinarily works, the Church, its ministry and its ordinances. In the ferment, which has followed this gift of God to man, light has mixed with darkness, truth with error, and pure religion with defiling superstition ; and during this fearful conflict, darkness, error and superstition have seemed, for long ages, victorious ; while light, Truth, and pure religion have appeared not only vanquished, but almost extinct. Nevertheless, in the WRITTEN form, which God has given to His Word, and in that wondrous Providence, which has watched over its integrity, He has given perpetual security to this Instrument of a final triumph in favor of Himself and His cause. What has appeared so often worsted in the conflict, has not been, in reality, the Word of Truth itself, but only those emanations from itself, which have gone out accompanied by the power of the Spirit, for leaven, for mixture, for hopeful or for doubtful operation through the great mass of surrounding evil. In itself, the Word has ever remained, on the whole, incorrupt ; giving forth its light, maintaining the ferment of good in the midst of evil, and preparing

the way for the time, when, the whole lump being leavened, Truth shall everywhere prevail, the world yield to its sway, and all human things settle down into the unfermenting calm of light, and peace, and love, ~~un~~^{and} Jesus, the Spiritual King of all the Earth.

In this grand warfare of good with evil, the Church, though often deeply corrupted with error and superstition, has yet, on the whole, been the visible medium for diffusing the powerful truths of the Bible. Though darkness, error, evil have flowed in upon her from the world and made her a strange mixture indeed, yet it must be remembered that, simultaneously, light, truth, good have flowed out from her into the world, and made it a somewhat better thing to look at and to live in than it once was. The Church is, by no means, a concrete of all the Christ and of all the Christianity, that are living on this earth. Through the Bible, and even through the Church herself, Christ and His Christianity have long been at work afar off, outside the walls of the visible Temple, and making the world of this Century very unlike the world of the first. Well, then, may we believe in the coming of a time, when the Church, purified at last from most, if not from all, of her errors and her evils, shall be felt in an influence simply benign ; when she shall become a widening circle of lights, radi-

ating truth only from Christ, her centre and her circumference, through the ministry, whom His right hand upholds ; and when all her ordinances, as included among those "mysteries of God," which have been committed to the "stewardship" of that ministry, shall be seen to operate, not in the darkly confounding prodigies of alleged perpetual miracle, but in the simple richness of that light of knowledge and of life, which, as through all her ministries, so also through all her Symbols, shineth down and shineth onward from her glorified and all-knowing Head.

That her Symbols are MYSTERIES in this sense only, the present Treatise has attempted to show. They are not such Mysteries as carry in themselves a perpetuated Incarnation of Christ ; but such Mysteries only, as collect and pour forth the powerful and sanctifying light, whereby the Comforter seeks to glorify Christ.

Some, I am aware, have sought to cast odium on this discussion on the ground that it is irreverent to attempt to explain Mysteries, which Christ has left in His Church, not to be curiously looked into, but to be received with simple, adoring faith. I can only say, that I have attempted this explanation in no spirit of irreverent speculation, but rather under the influence of an earnest love for the truth. To the light, whatever it may be, of

this Interpretation few, I trust, if any, will be blinded by prejudices against a Name, the mere word, EXPLANATION. In the language of Cicero, who, though a heathen, yet said many good things : "Rem vobis proposui ; vos eam *suo*, non *nominis* pondere penditote." "I have laid a subject before you : weigh ye it, not by its NAME, but by its OWN WEIGHT." If the Christian Mysteries were not given to be explained, then many, besides the present writer, have been profane while thinking themselves reverent servants of the Truth, and reverent worshippers of Him, who is the Truth.

For the attempt to explain mysteries, we have, indeed, inspired authority. An allusion, made a few moments since, naturally carries the mind back to one grand mystery, which, though not in the form of a Sacrament, has yet been left on record, with its appended explanation ; and from which somewhat may be gathered not inappropriate to the subject at this its closing stage. It was given in the vision, which the Evangelist of the Apocalypse was favored with on the Isle of Patmos.

"In the Spirit on the Lord's day," he "heard a great VOICE ;" and turning "to see the voice, which spake with" him, he "saw seven golden Candlesticks, and, in the midst of the seven Candlesticks, One like the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a

golden girdle. His head and hairs were white like wool, as white as snow ; and his eyes as a flame of fire ; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace ; and his voice, as the sound of many waters : and He had in His right hand seven stars : and out of His mouth went a two-edged sword : and His countenance was as the Sun shineth in his strength." Rev. i. : 9-16.

There was, indeed, a glorious Symbol, a truly Evangelic MYSTERY ; "the Mystery of the Seven Stars and of the Seven golden Candlesticks," with Him in the midst, who was "like unto the Son of man." It was a "Mystery" full of "VOICE" and full of LIGHT ; and He, who filled it, was girt in the robe and golden zone of Divine beauty and gracefulness. It was full of VOICE for teaching, and full of LIGHT for illumination ; and the garment, which was girt, was as a vesture of Righteousness, zoned with Truth. Its "voice" was as "many waters" for sounding forth ; and as "a two-edged sword" for piercing ; its "Eye" was "as a flame of fire" for searching ; its "countenance, as the Sun, shining in his strength," for shedding perfect day ; and its "garment," as holiness for an enrobing glory, with Truth for a girdle of gracious beauty.

Such was the wondrous Symbol, the Evangelic MYSTERY, in its DRESS : one like unto the Son of man, standing in the midst of seven golden Candle-

sticks, and holding in His right hand seven shining Stars ; more glorious in array than words could describe, and more powerful for action than thought could conceive. But, Mystery though it was, yet it was not a Mystery locked, and to be kept locked, from knowledge. It was significant, and it had its explanation. It was Christ, showing His relation to His light-bearing Churches. and to those true ministers, whom He upholds with the right hand of His divine power, and who, as starry lights, catch and cast forth, through His Churches upon the world, His own glorious effulgence of saving Truth and Life. "The Seven Stars," said the Interpreting Form, in that very idiom of Christ's native tongue, which He used at the Institution of His Last Supper, "The Seven Stars are the angels of the Seven Churches ; and the Seven Candlesticks are the Seven Churches." This, then, was not Christ, incarnate in a dark, incomprehensible Mystery ; but it was the most splendidly luminous Symbol of Christ and His Churches, ever conceived ; of Christ, upholding His true ministers by His power ; speaking through them His two-edged Word of life, in sounds awfully piercing to the sinner, and affectingly precious to the saint ; and casting through them on the Churches, and through the Churches on the wide world, the effulgent Daylight of His own saving Truth. The immediate

interest of the Symbol was for the Seven Churches of the Lesser Asia : but its ultimate interest is for the one Church of the whole earth.

This was "the Mystery," and the meaning of the Mystery. It was a Mystery, not because it was incomprehensible, not because it was never to be looked into, but because it was rich in a meaning designed to be understood, and luminously intelligible, the moment the word of Interpretation was spoken. In this respect, it was identical in character with the Mystery of the Bread and the Wine in the Lord's Supper. As the language of Christ, "This is my Body ; this is my Blood," was really INTERPRETING language, making plain what was designed to be understood, explaining the Symbolic Mystery of His acts in breaking and blessing the Bread and the Wine ;—so the words of Him, who spake in the vision. "The Seven Stars are the angels of the Seven Churches ; and the Seven Candlesticks are the Seven Churches ;" were truly INTERPRETING Words, making perfectly plain what was designed to be comprehended ; illuminating the grand Symbolic Mystery, which opens the Apocalypse.

Before saying our last words, let us dwell one moment longer on this instructive figure. In this Symbolic Mystery, Christ sets forth to all ages and to all lands the relation, which He holds to His

Church, as one whole, composed of many branches ; exhibiting Himself, not as Incarnate in "the mystical Body," but as the source and upholder of its ministry ; the source and Dispenser of its light ; its centrally supreme and governing Head ; directing its movements in the divinely merciful work of slaying sin, and of spreading both the light of Truth and the robe of holiness over all the earth : and this relation of Christ to his Church, this Agency of Christ through His Church, must become more and more perfectly apprehended and appreciated. His Church must carry less and less of the darkness of superstitious Mystery, and more and more of the light of evangelic Mystery ; until, finally, what was represented to the Lesser Asia by the mystic circle of the seven golden Candlesticks, with their accompanying seven shining Stars, shall have widened and thrown its circumference around the globe ; becoming, thus, the One Church of all lands ; and, with its numberless stellar angels, making universal "the Light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

To this splendid result every Christian, especially every Christian Minister, however humble be the station, in which he is placed, should, according to the ability and the grace given him, contribute his portion ; and nothing can absolve him from the guilt either of ceasing to shine forth

in his Master's light, or of turning that light into mere radiating darkness. Influenced by the power of this consideration, whoever, in the spirit of teachableness, humility and prayer, seeks to gather and give forth light from Christ ; and, in this spirit, and with this desire, goes to the Word of God, and looks at Him, who appears there, as "the Sun shining in His strength," may at least hope to be kept from becoming the unwilling disseminator of error instead of truth. Tremblingly, yet confidently, may he place his work at the feet of Him, who standeth in the midst of the golden Candlesticks, and who holdeth in His right hand the whole constellation both of the greater, and of the lesser lights ; leaving his labor there to be used as the Infinite in wisdom shall see fit to use it ; quieting himself with the thought, that, if His blessing justify, it will matter little who may condemn ; while if, withholding His blessing, He condemn, it will be of no avail though thousands attempt to justify the offering which is made.

THE END.

